DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 522 JC 880 072

AUTHOR Bauer, Paul F.
TITLE A Study of Some of America's Leading Community Colleges: A Sabbatical Report.
PUB DATE 30 Jun 87
NOTE 106p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *College Role; Community Colleges; *Educational Quality; Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Development; *Remedial Instruction; School Holding Power; Student Recruitment; *Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Cecil Community College MD

ABSTRACT

A sabbatical project was undertaken to determine the major issues facing community colleges and to determine the status of Cecil Community College (Maryland) relative to some of the leading community colleges in the eastern United States. The project consisted of 1- to 2-day visits to 12 colleges in addition to a review of relevant literature. Part I of the project report provides an introduction to major problems facing community colleges, reviewing the history of the two-year college movement and highlighting conflicts related to open access, developmental education, continuing education, the aging faculty, funding, and the social role of community colleges. Part II outlines the purpose of the study and offers 23 general observations based on institutional visits. After part III reviews the literature on concerns of and about community college faculty, part IV makes a number of observations and suggestions for addressing these concerns. The issues addressed include relations between faculty and administrators, the stagnation and revitalization of faculty, and faculty loyalties to discipline vs. college. Part V offers a literature review on developmental education, while part VI presents observations and suggestions on developmental education, retention, and marketing. The final sections present concluding remarks and an extensive bibliography. (UCM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED290522

# A Study of Some of America's Leading Community Colleges: A Sabbatical Report

Paul F. Bauer

Cecil Community College
1000 North East Road
North East, Maryland 21901

June 30, 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. F. BAUER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 880072



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Chinese word for crisis consists of two characters: one stands for danger, the other for opportunity.

"Opportunity is implicit in adversity. Hard times have produced some of higher education's greatest success stories."

Green and Levine, 1985, p. xi

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments . . . . . .i

Preface . . . . . ii

Prologue. . . . . iv

I. Introduction to the Problems . . . . . .1

II. The Purpose of the Study and General Observations. . 15

III. Review of the Literature on Faculty Concerns . . . . 30

IV. Observations and Suggestions for Faculty Concerns . . . . . 46

V. Review of the Literature on Developmental Education. 52

VI. Observations and Suggestions on Developmental Education, Retention and Marketing . . . . . 66

VII. Concluding remarks . . . . . 73

VIII. Footnotes . . . . . 84

IX. Appendixes. . . . . 87-8

X. Selected Bibliography . . . . . 89

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the Board of Trustees, Dr. Gell, the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Affairs Committee for providing me the opportunity to undertake this sabbatical project.

In addition, appreciation is extended to Ed Hockersmith and his staff who filled innumerable requests for inter-library loan materials.

Several good friends provided critical comments on various drafts of this paper, for their frankness and insights, I am grateful. The errors that remain are my responsibility.

For my hosts who received me on the campuses visited and for the presidents, vice-presidents, deans, chairpersons, faculty and support staff who openly shared their ideas with me, thank you for welcoming a stranger into your midst.

Finally, I want to thank Debbie Herd for smiling through numerous drafts of this paper.

## Preface

The purpose of this sabbatical project to study major issues facing community colleges was undertaken at some of the leading community colleges in the Eastern half of the United States.

In addition, various college members requested that I gather information on affirmative action policies; pay scales and ranking systems for support staff; organizational charts of business affairs staff; teaching loads for nursing faculty; measurement of morale; the interaction of continuing education and credit programs; the 15.5 policy and duty days for faculty.

With the exception of the last four items, the information requested has been shared directly with the individual(s) who requested it and is not included in this written report. Discussion of the last four items are included in this paper where appropriate.

The reader should note that many of the criticisms of community colleges found in the literature apply to four-year colleges and universities as well. However, the purpose of this study is to improve community colleges, not all of higher education. Hence, comments will not be made about higher education in general. However, the reader might want to note comparisons.

My belief is that community colleges are vital to the future of this country as Cecil Community College is to the future of our county. The opportunity for self improvement through education is an intrinsic right of every citizen. By removing the limitations of

geography, cost and birthright, community colleges have provided that opportunity to millions of citizens.

However, I also believe that, at the moment, community colleges are floundering, that the words of the critics ring so true. Yet I am determined to do what I can to keep the dream of a college education alive for those in Cecil County who wish to improve themeselves. It is with that hope that this paper is written.

Prologue

As you read this paper, keep in mind the following points from another institution, the automobile industry. Brock Yates in The Decline of the American Automobile Industry (New York: Random House, 1984; cited in Green and Levine, 1985, p. ix) presents eleven reasons why the automobile industry declined in power and importance. There are lessons here for community colleges.

1. Leaders of broad vision gave way to managers whose concern was the bottom line.
2. The industry emphasis shifted from product quality to finance and marketing.
3. Cost cutting took precedence over product improvement, updating, and development.
4. Form (glitter, chrome, and size) was exalted over substance (maintenance, mileage, and safety).
5. In bad times, the focus was on "quick fixes" rather than on long-term solutions.
6. The industry became increasingly self-absorbed and isolated.
7. There was a tendency to live in the past: major social and economic changes were not recognized; declining public confidence and satisfaction were not perceived.
8. New competitors (e.g., foreign car companies) were ignored.
9. The industry failed to keep up with new technologies.

10. A history of success was transformed into complacency and ultimately lethargy.

11. Work force solidarity declined. Alienation grew. Self-concern rose. A mood of "look out for number one" came to prevail.

# I. Introduction to the Problems

Clark Kerr (in Deegan and Tillery, 1985) tells us that the two great innovations in higher education have been the land-grant movement in the nineteenth century and the community college movement in the twentieth century. The community college movement began the great transformation into a learning society in which each person who wished to do so could study almost any subject in almost any geographical community (p. vii).

Yet now, the death knell may ring for America's community colleges. Circling over the "people's college," the critics multiply in both number and boldness. Why now, in the 1980s, is the community college movement nearly comatose when during the two decades from 1950-1970, community colleges, full of life and growth, and at the zenith of public support, were predicted to be the institution of higher learning for, at least, the rest of this century? What happened to the dream?

Kerr (in Deegan and Tillery, 1985) suggests that the dream is gone because the builders are almost all gone (p. viii) and because the "movement" has divided into too many parts (p. ix). For Kerr, the community college has become not a college but "...rather a series of groupings of institutions with those at one end of the spectrum having little resemblance to those at the other end" (p. ix).

Tillery and Deegan (1985) have traced the development of the dream of the American community college from its inception with

projections to the mid-1990s. According to the authors, three factors influenced the development of the modern community college, transforming it into an institution quite different from the founding junior college institution: rapid industrialization increased the need for trained men and women; public school systems produced more graduates; and the research university emerged at the top of the American higher education system (p. 3).

For the first seventy years, community colleges grew because they were freed from the restrictive academic procedures found at the university; local communities wanted "their" community college; and local, state and national advocates shaped an image of the community college which caught the excitement of the public (p.4).

In the first generation (1900-1930), community colleges, known then as junior colleges, were extensions of high schools. These early junior colleges, which allowed universities to concentrate on advanced coursework, made higher education available to a great number of people. However, the initial role of the junior college was not to produce transfer students, that concept emerged in the second generation (1930-1950), but instead, the role of the first generation junior college was to provide terminal education. William Rainey Harper, the founding father of community colleges, is quoted by Tillery and Deegan: "Students not really fitted by nature could stop naturally and honorably at the end of the sophomore year"

(p. 5). Local junior colleges began offering remedial courses for skills not taught or learned during high school and academic courses for those who needed to raise grade point averages prior to applying to the university. The mission, then, of the first generation of community colleges was to educate students "...who were neither fully prepared nor, perhaps, ready or able to leave home" (p. 6).

The second generation (1930-1950) was marked by articulation to facilitate transfer to four-year colleges. Here was the beginning of the break of junior colleges from the local high schools and of increased liaison with universities. Interestingly, once the break began from high schools so did the criticisms from high school teachers and counselors who questioned the educational quality of the junior college and wondered whether poor high school students should have a second chance in a junior college. Eight decades later their criticisms echo still; different voices, same words.

By 1950-1970, the third generation, in which Cecil Community College was born, emerged. By now, the separation from high schools was complete. Local Boards of Education which had also governed local junior colleges were replaced with separate boards to govern the local community colleges. The push was for autonomy in both governance and identity. Hence, the name "junior" was replaced with "community." In 1967, for example, I was hired to teach at Harford Junior College under the Board of Education; by 1968, I was a faculty member at Harford Community College operating under an independent Board of Trustees.

Generation four (1970-mid-1980s) gave birth to the concept of the comprehensive community college, founded on the rationale that public education should and could include grades 13 and 14. However, with the comprehensive community college concept came a great deal of confusion over the mission of the community college. During this period, comprehensive community colleges undertook a myriad of responsibilities: transfer, vocational-technical, developmental, and continuing education. However, some community colleges provided all of these components prior to the fourth generation. As soon as the comprehensive approach to education was in place, universities started blaming community colleges for neglecting their transfer responsibilities, for providing poor quality academic work and for competing for tax monies by claiming continuing education students for FTE.

Also, in this period, the rapid growth of community colleges so well chronicled in the third generation when "...a community college opened each week..." was derailed. Enrollments stabilized. "By the late 1970s, over seventy-five percent of total community college enrollments were in colleges with 4,000 or fewer students, and almost a third had fewer than 1000 students" (Tillery and Deegan, 1985, p. 17).

The fifth generation (mid-1980s-mid-1990s), according to Tillery and Deegan, will be defined by six major trends (p. 29-30). First, adults will have increasing needs for postsecondary education, be it occupational, academic remediation, and/or lifelong learning. Second, regional and local community variations in demographics,

economics and occupational characteristics will have a pronounced impact on how and what programs and services local community colleges develop to serve their communities. Community colleges will become more local than national in educational trends.

Third, new information and new technologies will change why, how and where people learn. Education will be an activity which can be accomplished anywhere, not just in a classroom. A fourth trend will find community colleges facing strong competition for resources at the same time they will be held to greater public accountability. Fifth, aging facilities and equipment will be an increasing problem in providing high quality education. And, finally, the sixth trend will be the advancing age of faculty which will increase the demand for local professional development of staff.

Whether these trends will bear fruit will depend upon how well colleges face the major conflicts now prevalent in the community college movement. The future is in doubt, while the voices of the critics grow louder.

Ironically, the symptoms of the disease so clearly diagnosed by the critics are the very areas which once were the lifesigns of the community college: mission, faculty, finances, open access and an abundance of students. Now the once clear mission of community colleges has become blurred with internal and external battles. Can, or should, a community college be both comprehensive and excellent? Are comprehension and excellence incompatible concepts? Or by becoming comprehensive have community colleges stretched their resources too thin to be excellent as well? What is the role of

non-credit courses? Must mission always follow funding? Can educational priorities be determined on their own merits, independent of educational fads, i.e., Black History?

The fourth generation saw the emergence of several major conflicts which now have put the role of the community college in jeopardy. One conflict is open access.

> The open-door concept has always been illusive, but until the late 1960s and 1970s it meant: to be successful the colleges should maintain a balance between their efforts to attract new students and their capacity for placement, instruction, and curriculum development (Tillery and Deegan, 1985, p. 19).

But during the fourth generation, open access came to mean "...efforts to seek, recruit, enroll and retain every possible student in the community" (Tillery and Deegan, 1985, p. 19).

Open access, with its companion, developmental education, once the pride of the community college movement, now is the magnet for doubt, attack, and confusion. Can, or should, developmental education be a major task of a community college? If so, then is the community college really a college? If not, then who should provide the developmental academic work for thousands of students who graduate from high school reading below an acceptable level for college study? And what would be the human and financial costs to society if we did not, at least, attempt to educate developmental students?

A second major source of conflict which emerged during the fourth generation and one which is a major component of the comprehensive mission of community colleges is the role of continuing education.

Criticisms usually focus on (1) the poor quality of continuing education courses, (2) whether community colleges are engaging in activities best left to other social agencies, and (3) whether taxpayers should pay for this education.

A third problem area is the faculty, once the nerve system of the community college, who now suffer from stagnation, aging in both mind and body. Faculty, who in the 1960s preached the social mission of the people's college, are disillusioned; they look beyond their college and often their teaching for personal identity and professional growth. They seek new prophets to admire, new causes to endorse, new dreams to fulfill. Many newer faculty, hired in the 1980s, may not even be familiar with the mission and the history of community colleges.

A fourth issue is funding. Where once state and local governments and the public in general willingly passed and supported legislation to finance "their" college, now they question return for their tax dollar in academic quality and educational accountability. The public has never really understood the role of the community college but supported it because every town or county wanted "their college" to boast civic pride and to educate some of their children. In fact, Cohen (1984) proposed that the "advent of the community college as a neighborhood institution did more to open higher education to broader segments of the population than did its policy of accepting even those students who had not done well in high school" (p. 11).

However, lack of understanding turns to cynicism about what a college is when taxpayers see too many students of low ability entering their local community college and emerging a few years later with Associate in Arts degrees. Hence, taxpayers are becoming increasingly reluctant to fund a community college to repeat what students should have learned in high school, or even elementary school, and to award degrees which diminish the prestige of a college education. While it appears that the public faults the public schools and not community colleges for the failure to teach basic skills, they are becoming reluctant to fund the teaching of those skills at the community college.

Consequently, Vaughan (1984), places the community college "at the watershed." For him, although some community colleges are re-examining their priorities, resources, and missions, they are failing to frame definitive answers (p. 38).

One major answer for mission comes from Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., past President of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, whom Vaughan (1984) calls the "chief proponent, prophet and symbol of the modern era in community college development" (p. 39). Gleazer's vision of the community college is a student-centered, community-based, performance-oriented people's college less concerned with being an institution of higher learning and more concerned with being a community center that shows little distinction between levels and types of education (p. 39). Gleazer goes so far as to suggest that community colleges might consider de-emphasizing their identification with higher education and even reconsider their use of

the term "college" because "...it may get in the way of what really needs to be done in the community" (Vaughan, 1984, p. 41).

But on the other hand, some critics, such as Richardson, Fisk, and Okun (1983) believe that the philosophical commitment of the 1960s to provide opportunity through open doors has become an economic imperative in the 1980s to provide open access to ensure institutional survival (p. xi; emphasis added). Such may be the case as long as community colleges are funded for FTE. However, if developmental education required by emphasizing open access now is an economic necessity for survival, and not a philosophical principle of the community college's mission, one would expect that more attention would be given to assure its success. As we shall see, such has not been the case.

What happens instead is that the pressure to remain fiscally solvent causes some administrators to fill classes with bodies, regardless of academic ability, which, in turn, adds to the disillusionment of faculty. In addition, continuing education, heralded as the financial savior of community colleges, has grown with few, if any, standards for quality or criteria for hiring of faculty, even further alienating the credit faculty, and adds to the public's confusion over what is a college.

For Breneman and Nelson (1981), a diminishing interest on the state level to finance non-credit courses may well doom the future of community colleges.

Declining enrollments, especially in transfer programs, combined with the pressure to increase tuition, may put an Associate in Arts

degree out of the reach of the low-middle to low income groups, the very populations community colleges were created to educate. Research shows that historically middle and upper middle income families do not send their children to the local community college. Those demographics, however, may be changing. For example, the student from the lowest economic bracket is almost two-and-a-half times as likely to enter a community college as is a student from the highest quartile. Yet, the highest concentration of community college students falls into two diametrically opposite groups: the low academic, high socio-economic student and the high academic, low socio-economic student (Hunt, Klieforth and Atwell, 1977, p. 17).

The poor academic ability of community college students is a major focus of the critics. Cross (1976; 1981; 1985), one of the most articulate critics, questions the educational opportunities available to such students in a community college. Devall (1968) argues that community colleges should not even exist; the services they provide, he argues, can be met more rationally and effectively by other social organizations such as proprietary schools, on-the-job-training, and extension services of universities.

To the discussion of the academic ability of community college students, some critics add the dimension of social stratification. Karabel (1972), Pincus (1980) and Templin, Daniel and Shearon (1977) see social stratification and social class conflict as the real markers of community colleges, not the "open access" often proclaimed the significant contribution to society of the community college. For them, the egalitarian model of the community college may be a

facade philosophy advocated by those who really believe in and want to perpetuate a meritocracy.

Karabel (1972) suggests, for example, that the real genius of the community college movement is that it seemly fulfills the traditional American quest for equality of opportunity without sacrificing the principle of achievement. For him, open access does not automatically lead to a genuine expansion of educational opportunity. The critical question is not who gains access to higher education, but rather what happens to people once they get there (pp. 523, 530; emphasis added).

Meyer (1977) supports Karabel's thesis by arguing that education allocates individuals to a fixed set of positions in society. Instead of education allowing individuals to become socially mobile, according to Meyer, education in a community college distributes a fixed number of positions already determined by economic and political forces.

The real aim of community colleges is to socialize individuals to accept the limitation of roles available to them and to adjust to those limitations, according to many critics. Clark's (1960) "cooling out" process whereby marginal students are subtly forced into certain academic programs is one example. Community colleges do not expand the roles in society, they act as educational gatekeepers who determine who earns the few upwardly mobile positions available. The "losers" remain socially and economically as before.

The critics are a formidable group. Their arguments are well reasoned, clearly written, and, in most cases, supported with solid

statistical data. They can not be easily dismissed as obstructionists who dwell in the seclusion, and security, of the university looking down upon their less-then-equal colleagues in the community colleges.

Yet, from most, this reader gains the impression that the critics are not attacking to destroy community colleges, but in the hopes that community college leaders will listen and respond, so that the community colleges can regain the vitality, the excitement, the sense of mission, which characterized them in the 1950-1970 span. One would expect then, that community college leaders would respond in kind, with sharp, clear counterarguments or with acceptance of the weaknesses followed by substantial action to correct them. Such has not been the case.

Community colleges are floundering in part because community college leaders have been silent or have resorted to dusting off the bromides of the 1950s. To the specific comments of the critics, the advocates answer with generalities, with intellectual fluff. While they proclaim the community college is alive and well, the vision of the people's college is dying.

The bulwark in the first line of defense against the attacks of the critics should be manned by community college presidents. Yet, they have abandoned their posts, or never assumed them. Vaughan (1986), himself a president, on the lack of response by his peers, states:

> Since the majority of the presidents did not grow up in a home with college-educated parents, it is unlikely that they were accustomed to the "point and counterpoint" type of discussions that one expects to occur routinely in homes where the parents have college degrees.

> The combination of heading one's "own college" and viewing that college as serving one's "own kind of people" would seem to create a defensive stance among many presidents and would explain in part the unwillingness of many community college leaders to examine their institutions critically (p. 14).

Nor have the faculty assumed the posts abandoned by the presidents. The faculty feel as if they have been isolated from the daily governance of the college. They report that their role in the governance of their college has been assumed by administrators who are more interested in finances than in quality education. So they turn to their academic disciplines at the sake of loyalty to their institution. Once they have settled into middle age, their need for personal security overshadows their willingness to take risks.

In fact, for O'Keefe (1985), the increasing age of faculty, combined with other factors beyond their control, may, in the long run, be significant to a college's survival. Declining enrollments have reduced faculty mobility among institutions; hence, many faculty feel trapped at their current institution and see few possibilities for career growth and/or escape from unhappy work environments (see note 1). Second, lagging salary increases and the possibility of reductions in staff because of enrollment declines make many faculty anxious about their future. Third, (and perhaps most important to the survival of community colleges) their concern about job security and salaries reduces their openness and frankness to discuss problems and weaknesses of their institutions (p. 14; emphasis added).

Lacking worthy foes with a clear counterargument, the critics' message, removed from the arcane pages of academic journals, has filtered to the general population, already confused about a

community college's role. The death knell may be ringing for some colleges. Keller (1983), for example, warns that "...between 10-30% of America's 3,100 colleges and universities will close...or merge with other institutions by 1995" (p. 3).

Hesburgh (1983) suggests that two hundred colleges will close by the year 2000 and will deserve their fate because they reacted to long-term problems with short-term solutions. He further states that these colleges are already educationally marginal, have weak faculties and curricula, have low standards and attract "bottom-of-the-barrel" students (p. 16). Although neither Keller nor Hesburgh say what percentage, if any, of these two hundred colleges are community colleges, it takes little insight to know of whom they are speaking, especially Hesburgh.

## II. The Purpose of the Study and General Observations

Accepting warnings sounded by the critics that America's community colleges have started down a decline towards oblivion, yet, at the same time believing community colleges can again be vital, exciting educational institutions, I undertook a sabbatical leave project to study issues central to the survival of community colleges.

My study consisted of one to two day visits to twelve colleges (see Appendixes I and II), plus reading the literature on community colleges. Eight colleges were members of the twenty-five member League for Innovation and four were suggested by an officer in a national community college organization. Some colleges were similar to Cecil in enrollment, budget, and location; others were large, urban schools (5,000 - 10,000 FTE) with budgets many times greater than Cecil's. In all cases, Cecil's comparative position was strong. As I reported to Cecil's Board of Trustees, " In comparison, we don't look bad at all."

This writer finds Cecil's strengths to be both external and internal. Externally, because of our President's leadership, Cecil enjoys an excellent relationship with local government officials. Their respect for, and pride in, "their college" is evident in their generosity during budget decisions. Again, because of our President's leadership, Cecil has a growing Foundation dedicated to making Cecil a leading institution. In addition, in recent years, the Division of Continuing Education and Community Services has

established a meaningful presence in the community. Our new location in Elkton should enhance our role in postsecondary education. Also, Cecil is ahead of most of the colleges I visited in establishing articulation agreements with both four-year colleges and universities and the local public school system.

Our internal strengths are numerous. Generally, our faculty is stable and dedicated. The college community still is small enough that we personally know most of our students, yet we are large enough to have resources available which are not found at some small community colleges. Our business office is a smoothly functioning unit of the college. Our long-range fiscal plan provides guidelines for decision making. Our support staff are dedicated and loyal and take an active role in college activities, especially raising money for scholarships. Our LRC provides services only dreamed of, even at some of the largest schools I visited. Cecil's physical plant is well maintained and the addition to the Arts and Sciences Building will unify our campus. Considering their small numbers, our student services division provides a great number of services. Our administrative computer capabilities are the envy of many of the colleges visited. Most importantly, we still believe in what we are doing.

In contrast, our weaknesses, as viewed by this writer, are those found at other community colleges, including some of those visited. Our weaknesses, then, are not unique to Cecil. We lack articulated value statements which guide the mission of our college and especially our continuing education division. We cooperate within

divisions, but not between divisions. Too many local high school teachers and counselors do not respect us. Some of our faculty lack the training, and perhaps the motivation, to teach critical literacy skills, especially to academically deficient students. Since we know neither the level of academic skills necessary for success at Cecil, nor the level of exit skills of our graduates, we really do not know what the value of a Cecil education is.

However, as I have said, absolutely none of these weaknesses, are unique to Cecil. As the literature tells us, all community colleges are experiencing these same problems. What then is unique about Cecil is our combined talents, skills and leadership which we can use to solve these problems.

This report, then, contains ideas which have proven to be successful at some of the leading community colleges in the nation and are offered as springboards for Cecil's solutions. If the critics were being answered anywhere, I assumed it would be at our leading community colleges. And the ideas working for them might find a usefulness at Cecil Community College, and at our sister community colleges, particularly, small, rural colleges.

These observations are offered with the following conditions. As much as possible, I attempted to remain objective when gathering information. By that, I mean, when an idea was presented I did not immediately discount it because "...it would never work at Cecil." Consequently, the ideas offered here are made without consideration for costs or personnel. The costs, skills and/or personalities of the current staff at Cecil were not considerations in screening

ideas. The only ideas eliminated were those we have already incorporated here more fully than at the host college. If we were already doing it and doing it better, it was not logged in my notes. Hence, these ideas cover a wide range of requirements in costs, skills and personnel. They are offered as they are, in no priority order, so that they might stimulate thoughts and actions more appropriate for our campus and our resources.

In addition to gathering specific information and ideas about each college, I also gathered informal, subjective impressions of the colleges visited. Asking for directions, sitting in a student lounge, listening to clerical staff talk (see note 2), walking the campus, all provided opportunities to sense the informal, but nevertheless, real climate of a college. Often, as one might suspect, these observations were in direct conflict with what I was told was the "official" college climate.

The remainder of this chapter consists of a potpourri of ideas and suggestions. In contrast to the following chapters, these ideas are not united on a theme.

1. Each of the colleges visited was proactive both internally and externally. Their leaders were bright, well-read, aggressive individuals who could look into the future as well as work in the present. Consequently, the colleges attempted to anticipate problems before they occurred. Colleges with nursing programs anticipated declines in enrollments and had alternate programs in place. One college initiated drug testing for their student-athletes immediately after the death of Len Bias in the summer of 1986. Several initiated

early retirement plans to address the issue of an aging faculty and most have developed professional development activities to revive inert faculties.

2. Externally, the colleges were alert and highly sensitive to community reactions to college programs and were active in promoting programs to meet the educational needs of the community, in some cases, even before the community knew they had such a need. For example, one college assigned a staff member to attend the meetings of the local economic development group. When new industry and business considered locating into that area, the college contacted them to assess their training needs. Thus, potential industries and businesses knew of the college and their programs while they were making the decision to locate in the area. In most cases, the active involvement of the college, and their willingness to provide services, was a major factor in the company's decision to locate in the area. Here is a good example of a college following Parnell's call to "put America back to work."

3. One of the most frequent criticisms of community colleges is the lack of a consistent mission. Their mission, because of the diverse components comprising a comprehensive community college, becomes whatever will be funded, i.e., mission follows funding. For example, at one time, community colleges, faced with a decline in transfer students, shifted to career courses when those monies became available through the Vocational Education Act of 1963, among other sources. On the other hand, it can be argued that community colleges turned to career education in response to community needs and as the

result of changing patterns in careers. Another example of mission following funding, taken from Vaughan (1983), is the intense recruiting of senior citizens when their enrollment counted as FTE, but in states which dropped them from the funding formulas, these colleges not only stopped recruiting senior citizens, they viewed them as nuisances on campus (p. 15).

Now colleges are shifting to non-credit, continuing education programs in states which provide funding for those enrollments. For Vaughan (1983), continuing education is, in his words, the "best" example of how funding influences mission. If the state funds continuing education courses, or if the college is able to earn additional revenue through continuing education, he says, the college emphasizes it. But if funding is not available, little or no emphasis is given (p. 15).

However, at the colleges I visited, "mission follows funding" was not the case; for them quality was the first concern, then funding. These colleges looked first at whether they could provide quality instruction; if they could not, then they did not seek funding. "What do we do best?" was the guiding question, not "Where is the funding available?" Some of the colleges visited, for example, made the decision not to seek JPTA funding or to establish extensive continuing education programs because they did not believe they could be both comprehensive and excellent without the transfer of monies and staff weakening credit programs. Instead, they marketed existing programs with new emphasis to maintain a stable enrollment.

However, weak credit programs were reduced or eliminated to devote energies and monies to other areas. One college eliminated a hotel management degree program with low enrollments and shifted the staff and monies into a growing travel and tourist program that trained travel agents to supplement the increased tourist promotion of the area. Nevertheless, the sequence always was quality then funding.

4. The literature, particularly Vaughan (1986), documents that the majority of current community college presidents are pragmatic, business-oriented leaders as opposed to the founders who were educational philosophers. For the distinct differences in leadership styles, and the resulting educational policies, between these two types of leaders, the reader is referred to Vaughan's The Community College President (1986).

From my observations, there now is a trend toward hiring humanistic administrators as presidents and top-level administrators. Part of the explanation for the trend is the thought, shared with me by more than one president, that boards of trustees are looking for people-oriented presidents who might increase student retention and improve campus morale.

In addition when hiring, most of the colleges looked first at the applicant as a person. They actively sought new hires who were professionally and personally secure. For them, the person was more important than the credentials; although, of course, credentials were not minimized. This is important especially in small community colleges where individuals were expected to fill several professional

roles requiring more personal skills than formal training over the course of a career. Many examples of this phenomenon exist at Cecil. A current example is an individual whose academic credentials are in physical education and educational administration, yet he has become a self-trained expert on the multitude of knowledge required to supervise and coordinate new buildings.

5. Much is being made of America's growing rate of illiteracy and our poor ranking academically compared to other industrialized nations. Consequently, most of the colleges visited are taking an active part in their community to address this problem because they believe it must be done, not because funding is available. Here is a good example of mission determining funding. Cecil could make a public statement of our educational values by teaching reading, study skills, and critical thinking skills to the children of our students. The courses could be free or at a significantly reduced tuition. Preventive medicine is less expensive than the cure.

6. Also, we might make a public statement on the importance of standards in written English. One college used the following in their catalogue under the heading "Written English Standard:"

> When written English used in student papers and examinations in any discipline is deemed by the receiving faculty member to be at a level unacceptable for that course, the grade for that work will be appropriately affected and the student will be counseled to seek diagnostic and corrective help from a suitable source.

7. Both the literature and my visits confirm that most community colleges are mediocre because they do not face the issues raised by the critics. The survival of these colleges and others will depend

upon strong leadership to establish a local mission and to confront their weaknesses. The community college movement, i.e., general similarities among community colleges across the nation, no longer exists. Now, each community college stands alone and will succeed or fail, not because they are part of a national movement (which sufficed in the 1950-1970 period), but because they are able to carve out an identity for themselves in their local community.

The colleges visited were proactive, knew what they did best, and knew their community. "Each college must find its own future. It will lie in the uniqueness of each institution" (Hesburgh, 1983, p. 17; emphasis added). For example, Monroe Community College is a thriving institution because it has carved out a distinct identity which allows it to compete with the fourteen other colleges in the greater Rochester area. They were able to accomplish this distinct identity because they demonstrated their usefulness and quality to the populations they serve.

8. Major components of the uniqueness of the colleges visited are group cohesion, teamwork and campus pride, intangibles evident even to a short-term visitor. These colleges built teamwork and pride with celebrations of traditional events which mark the reason for their existence and amplify their mission. Piedmont Virginia Community College, for example, holds an annual tea for faculty and staff selected for distinguished service to the college. Receptions are held in what they call the "window room," a section of the student services area with a glass wall looking out on a beautiful view of the mountains. With the new building at Cecil, we should establish a special place for special occasions.

9. The college might consider training volunteers in standard first aid and CPR. On a rotating basis, members of the group would be on campus whenever the college is open.

10. To communicate the responsibilities of their positions, the two academic divisional chairs at Cecil should be promoted to assistant deans. Their responsibilities, fiscally and academically, are equal to assistant and associate deans at the colleges I visited. This suggestion is not an example of the old saying, "When you can't give money, give titles." Rather the titles should be changed to reflect the immensity of their responsibilities and to accent the importance of academics.

11. At Central Piedmont Community College, humanities courses, especially second-year courses, are run with lower required enrollments than other classes because the college places value on producing well- rounded, educated students. More will be said later about the importance of advanced courses for faculty morale and student retention.

12. The most frequent complaint from the nine presidents I interviewed was the public's non-understanding of the community college mission. The presidents did not believe that the general public knew enough even to misunderstand community colleges. This complaint is important since it is true especially for the uneducated, blue-collar population from where community college students often come. In addition, it has been suggested in this paper that lack of public understanding of the role of the community college rapidly is turning to cynicism. Since lack of understanding

is more easily corrected than is cynicism, Cecil must move quickly to teach the community the importance of their college.

Moll (1985) reinforces this perspective of the presidents when he says "...the public image of a college often does not match the self-perceived mission of the institution" (p. 165). Further, he continues, once a public image has been established in America, it remains set unless there is an ambitious, self-conscious campaign to change it (p. 165).

On the other hand, Templin (1983) believes that the increased number of middle-class students with above average college board scores will improve the image of the community college (p. 45). The image study undertaken recently at Cecil is a first step in dealing with our image in the community and will be especially important in dealing with high school teachers, and counselors, long caldrons of criticisms (see page 3 above).

13. The college might consider giving each employee an end-of-the- year report on the college's contributions on their behalf for fringe benefits, FICA, etc.

14. To prevent potential legal problems when certain students are denied admission the college should consider the following statement for the catalogue :

> The college reserves the right to deny admission to any applicant when appropriate ideas of scholarship, traits of good citizenship, character or deportment may indicate unfavorable adjustment to the college's program.

15. To help establish a writing-across-the-curriculum program, Brookdale Community College has a series of "Second Pair of Eyes"

meetings where administrators and faculty share a current writing project for group critique. The groups consist of individuals who share anything from a memorandum to a short story. The aim of these meetings was first to introduce faculty and administrators to good writing and second to show the faculty that the administration took the issue seriously.

16. Because of the increasing age of the faculty, Cecil needs an early retirement plan. The colleges visited used a graduated system, i.e., if an individual retires between the ages of 53-56, he/she receives a one-time sum of $20,000; 57-60, $15,000; 60-65, $10,000. (The dollar amounts are for illustration only and were not exact amounts used by the colleges).

17. Following the death of an employee, regardless of position, who has been employed for a specified number of years, the college should consider allowing the spouse and/or dependents, enrolled under the college-funded health insurance plan, to remain insured for twelve months. Also, dependents (spouse and children), regardless of age at employee's death, could receive free tuition up to an Associate in Arts degree whenever they wish to enroll.

18. Since most students do not finish their programs of study in four consecutive semesters, Cecil might drop the semester-by-semester sequence of courses per program in the catalogue and simply list courses needed for program completion.

> "Whether the institution is called a two-year college or not is less important than what the college communicates to its students about the length of time required to complete a particular program. Leaders should ensure that college

> personnel and publications accurately describe the normal completion periods for all students, including those requiring remediation" (Knoell, 1983, p. 36).

19. Since more frequent contact with students improves the chances of retaining students, one school established an "information network" in which ten percent of the student body, randomly selected and not identified, provided feedback on college issues (e.g., are our brochures attractively done?). Questionnaires were mailed out at various times during the year with stamped, return envelopes. Students were not identified unless they wished to be, but they felt as if they were helping to improve their college. In return, the college administrators received feedback from students by which they could measure progress on various projects.

20. Another college held "quality circles" at the beginning of each academic year to discuss a general topic, e.g., "how can we improve our division?" No immediate supervisor was present and each group on campus, administration, faculty and staff, participated. Each supervisor provided feedback on the suggestions within one month. As the result of these, and other activities, the atmosphere on this campus was one of teamwork, not one of "we versus they" atmosphere which prevails on so many campuses.

Also the climate on this campus encouraged risk taking and creative ideas. The flow of ideas was from the bottom up, as well as from the top down. People felt a part of their campus, because they knew they made a difference in the functioning of the college. Consequently, campus pride was high as was morale. For example,

nearly everyone wore a lapel pin with the college's initials. It is probably no accident that this campus was the most immaculate in appearance.

21. More than four-year colleges and universities, or other community colleges, the colleges visited identified proprietary schools as their major competitors for students. With significant enrollments in the careers divisions, and thus much at stake, these colleges were sensitive to competition from proprietary schools which advertised short completion times, financial aid and job placement services. Since two of the components already were in place, the colleges responded with flexible scheduling. Cecil, also, might want to adjust scheduling of some classes to compete with proprietary schools (who advertise on Baltimore and Philadelphia television). In addition to serving career students, more flexible scheduling, if facilities are available, might assist the transfer student and the student taking courses to update job skills. Students could be surveyed to see if they would take courses on Saturday afternoons, three-and-a-half week classes, Winterterm classes, etc.

22. One school has been very successful in offering developmental coursework in the summer for high school students (9th to 11th grades). Courses include reading, mathematics, English, and study skills. Cecil also might consider a summer course for high school seniors going to college in September (at Cecil or elsewhere) on "how to study in college."

23. Each of the League colleges, in various forms, always asked two questions in every step of their educational planning: "What can

we do better?" and "Are we doing what we say we are?" Dennison (1984-1985) sums up why these colleges are the leaders:

> The essential theme of the pursuit of status may be expressed in one statement: The quality of educational institutions will be measured, not by what they do, but by how well they accomplish what they claim to do (p. 61; emphasis added).

## III. Review of the Literature on Faculty Concerns

The differences between the critics and the advocates of community colleges are not only over educational standards and procedures, but also over values. This dissonance over what should be the values of a college education, and hence the mission of a community college, underlies many discussions. The critics will not be silenced and community colleges will not regain their vitality until we assess our value systems. We, in community colleges, espouse a public set of values while daily we live a contradictory set of values.

To take but one example, developmental education has become a focal point of community colleges and their faculties. Often the statement was heard on my visits that "...we can do it better than the public schools or the universities." We talk of our belief in allowing students to start at their own level and our goal of raising those starting points to the collegiate level. Yet our developmental programs really are built upon the expectation of a high turnover in students. Otherwise why would there be the low number of staff and the low allocation of funds assigned to developmental education? If we really thought we would be successful with developmental students, more staff and monies would be available. But, the highest rate of failure in community colleges is students in these programs. We promise opportunity; we deliver failure.

Another focal point of community colleges in recent years which has influenced faculty has been the consistent decline in the number of transfer students. However, statistics on that decline are misleading. Traditional transfer students who enter the community college with the goal of earning a bachelor's degree in the humanities or sciences are declining in number but have been replaced since the mid-1970s with students who obtain an Associate in Arts degree in occupational programs and then transfer. Career education, once considered terminal, now produces more students who complete occupational programs and then transfer to universities than do those who complete transfer programs (Cohen, 1981, p. 8).

Cohen (1981) cites two reasons for this shift in the composition of transfer students. For one, occupational programs, such as those in the emerging technologies and the health fields, have recently required a bachelor's degree for entry into a career. Second, there has been a shift in reasons for taking transfer courses. For example, the courses traditionally labeled as transfer now are being taken by students who have not made a commitment to a definite field of study and who are exploring their career options.

Also, many students enrolled in transfer courses already have college degrees and enroll in the community college to take courses for personal interest such as art history or the history of ideas. Incidentally, the age of students enrolling in courses for personal interest tends to be higher than the average age of community college students. As the age of these students goes up, the number of credit hours they attempt goes down (Cohen, 1984, p. 32). At Cecil, the

senior citizens who enroll in art courses are a good example. They are not transfer students, but instead, are students taking transfer courses. And, finally, some students enroll in transfer courses to acquire prerequisites or to improve their grade point average prior to applying for an occupational program with selective admissions, such as nursing.

Because so many of these "transfer" students never complete a degree, and never intended to, statistics on completion rates for "transfer" students are low. The typical reaction of community college administrators is to say that a high percentage of students are achieving their objectives. Yet, such objectives are seldom defined in reports while the level of achievement goes unmeasured. For Richardson, Fisk and Okun (1983), it is "...an unstated corollary of the community college philosophy that questioning the benefits of attendance constitutes heresy" (p. 26).

In short, transfer programs, once the backbone of the community college curriculum and the focus of instruction, now have become a catchall. Apparently, many students are using the college in one way while the college operates and instructs in another (Cohen, 1984, p. 8). The value system of these students is different from the value system of the community college. As the conflict of values distinguishes the critic-advocate debate, so it does the relationship of faculty and administration.

The importance of good teaching has been emphasized since the earliest days of the community colleges; in fact, teaching was the raison d'etre for community colleges (Cohen, 1984, p. 147). Over the

years, community colleges have taken justifiable pride in the strength of their faculty. "We have a good faculty" has been an universally expressed sentiment and one heard on each of the campuses visited. From 1950-1970 that was true. Today, however, such statements border on being anachronisms. In fact, all too many faculty do not even remain current in their discipline. Consequently, Cohen (1984) says that many community college curricula are "frozen in time" (p. 296). Today's faculty suffer from, at least, three ailments: their lack of political power on campus; their social standing in the community; and their professional loyalties. Immediate remedies are not in sight.

Freed from the publish or perish syndrome of their counterparts at the university, community college faculty originally centered their energy and skill on teaching. But those were exuberant days when traditional transfer students filled our classes and extensive developmental education had yet become the commission of the community college. The students of those days possessed (or at least are now, in retrospect, perceived to have possessed) the same values of the academy in which the faculty had been trained and in which they continued to train their students: desire to learn, research and writing skills and a thirst for knowledge for its own sake. Now nationally, in contrast, only one of ten community college courses requires a prerequisite, only one of ten is a sophomore-level course (Cohen, 1981, p. 8), and over 85% of the community college enrollment is in survey courses which require no prerequisite (Cohen and Brawer, 1982, p. 40). To ensure sufficient enrollment, many advanced courses do not carry prerequisites.

This decline in the number of upper-level liberal arts transfer courses places both the faculty and the institution in a dilemma. The significant enrollment of developmental students, and their lack of success, lowers the probability that such courses will be taught; yet, if they are not offered, the traditional college student will transfer to a four-year college before completing an Associate in Arts degree, thus further reducing the viability of the liberal arts in the community college. At the moment, less than one in five students completes two years at a community college (Cohen, 1984, p. 34).

Some faculty, consequently, are required to teach seemingly endless sections of introductory courses. Even dedicated faculty tend to lose motivation when faced with such a teaching load. One faculty member interviewed at a midwestern community college has taught English 101 exclusively for six years. Not a single advanced level English course assigned to her had made enrollment in that time period. But, as she said, "At least I still have a job...a boring job, but a job nevertheless." Or faculty are required to teach developmental courses. In 1980, for example, one third of community college English and mathematics courses were below college level (Friedlander, 1980, p. 6).

In addition, at one time the distance between faculty and administrators was but a trace in the dust. "We are all in this together so let's work together. We are pioneers," was the prevailing attitude. Now that line has widened to a crevice. Consequently, faculty have withdrawn into themselves and their

disciplines. The prevailing attitude has become "we versus they," marked by mistrust, suspicion and paranoia. When the social mission died, so did the team concept in many community colleges.

Seidman (1985) interviewed community college faculty in Massachusetts, California and Texas. His findings are not encouraging. Faculty once identified with the egalitarian mission of the community college; they believed everyone had the right to a college education. For them, then, whether or not a student succeeded was up to the student, not the social class or the academic preparation brought to class. The opportunity was waiting, just through those open doors of the local community college.

Alas, the social mission which inspired so many of us who began teaching in the 1960s is gone.

> In the sixties and early seventies, the sense of breaking new ground in the community college, and the excitement of participating in an educational movement, had as one of its central sources of energy the imperative to provide equitable educational opportunity. In the 1980s that energy is difficult to sustain when it ceases to be part of a broader societal imperative (Seidman, 1985, p. 10).

In addition, faculty feel as if they are not equal in standing to their university colleagues. Whether they are actually perceived as less than a professor by the general population is less important than how they believe they are perceived.

> "...there is a nagging, pervasive sense, for both faculty and students, that being at a community college means being near the bottom of the higher education totem pole" (Seidman, 1985, p.11).

Perhaps we have forgotten Goethe's dictum: It is not the place that ennobles the individual, but the individual who ennobles the place.

However, Astin (1983) argues that the use of such criteria as preparation of students, number of Ph.D's, size of library, etc., which cause some critics to put community colleges at the bottom of the educational hierarchy is fallacious. The fallacy of using these criteria, he states, is that they say something about what an institution has but very little about what it does (p. 134; emphasis added).

Faculty have responded, in Seidman's study, with withdrawal; they have exited. Hirschman (1970) discusses three kinds of faculty: exit, loyal and voice. "Exited" faculty, he states, withdraw from all activities except those related directly to the classroom or those required by written faculty policies; they, however, do remain committed to their colleagues, to their students, and to their teaching. But they are unconcerned about institutional priorities. He also adds that "exited" faculty are "...unreachable regardless of the strategies the administration used; there is no way of altering their behavior as a result of administrative initiatives" (p. 136).

In contrast to the "exited" faculty, Hirschman (1970) points to the "loyal" faculty. This group usually is the most recently hired; in fact, he asserts, they are hired in part because they are screened for their attitudes; i.e., they are hired because during the interview they express agreement with current administrative policies.

However, with time, the "loyal" faculty tend to become "exit" faculty once they "...encounter limited resources, passive resistance or indifference from a majority of their colleagues, and active

resistance from the third segment (voice) of the faculty." This third group, the "voice" faculty, actively resist administrative priorities. Because of the volume of their criticism, the "voice" faculty are highly visible, despite their small numbers. Nevertheless, they are the "loyal opposition" who are committed to their college.

At the colleges visited, estimates by both administration and faculty leaders of the percentage of faculty who have "exited" ranged from 25% to 65%. One academic dean estimated that twenty-five percent of his faculty equaled their teaching salary in outside consulting work. Teaching is not a high priority for this group. Many faculty come onto campus, teach their classes, keep minimal office hours and exit, only to repeat the sequence each day, each semester, until retirement. Of course, that conclusion is the formal one, many already may have "retired." "Again and again the faculty, especially those with some years of experience, talked of keeping a low profile in the college" (Seidman, 1985, p. 43; emphasis added).

Their noninvolvement, Seidman asserts, comes from a feeling of futility, of being tired of fighting for faculty power and losing the fight. Faculty believe they receive double messages from their administrators, according to Seidman: "Numbers are important" and, in the same breath, "Maintain your standards" (p. 76) (see note 3). Orris (1985) states that "...all too often we are caught up in the numbers game ...We need to take a look at the quality of our work and the product with much less emphasis on quantity" (p. 11).

For example, one instructor at an eastern community college went to great pains to go to her office and bring to the conference room where we were meeting a huge stack of papers. The papers were mid-term essays written in her four art history classes. The writing was dismal, at best. For example, Mike Angelo painted the Sistine Chapel, not Michelangelo. Her students, obviously, did not possess the academic skills to study art history; yet, by her own account, if they had not been allowed to enroll, she would not have a full-time job. She told me that several years ago she had put aside her educational principles and stopped arguing with the administration about maintaining educational standards. Now, she made her living "teaching;" her compromise of values was justified by working part time as a curator for a local museum.

The low ability of many students allowed to enroll to make the budget discourages the faculty yet provides them with a livelihood. One faculty member summed it up:

> Since the education I received was terribly important to me, I have the natural desire to perpetuate it. I am always having to come to terms with the difference between what my students want and where they are and where I was (Nancy Warren, an English professor in Massachusetts, in Seidman, 1985, p. 111).

But colleges do little to assist faculty to become better teachers, especially better teachers of students with low ability. Teachers learn to teach the student with low academic ability by trial and error, or give up (Case, 1985, p. 84). Consequently, the number of involved, traditional faculty with educational standards and professional values, such as Ms. Warren, is getting smaller and smaller (Freedman, 1980, p. 7).

Among Seidman's recommendations, one which Cecil might consider, is to establish reading and writing skills across all curricula (transfer and career). Reading and writing are so intrinsic to learning, thinking and social mobility, that Seidman insists, these skills must be established at the center of all curricula in the community college (p. 271). He even goes so far as to suggest that writing be part of every class every time it meets (p. 278).

According to Seidman (1985), the key to understanding the future direction, and the success of that direction, of the community college is understanding the faculty and their perceptions of their work. If he is correct, most community colleges are in trouble.

For the moment, faculty perceive themselves caught in institutions whose efficacy and purpose are under attack on many fronts; where increased bureaucratic decision making has excluded them as voices in their own destiny; where a shift in the public's social and political priorities, from equal access to education to conservation of tax dollars, has made them and their jobs expandable; and where their place in the higher education hierarchy is the bottom. Magnifying these perceptions is the constant demand to maintain enrollment, to "make the FTE" regardless of the academic potential of the student.

Further aggravating this problem is the increased consumerism of students, which first emerged in higher education in the 1970s. Cohen (1984) says that now student-consumers:

> ...dictate the terms under which they will study, what they will study, what they expected to obtain from their efforts. Under these conditions, an education that

> demanded commitment, adherence to traditions, the intensity of scholarly inquiry, examination of alternative value systems - the bases of the liberal arts - could not sustain itself. It had few adherents within or outside the academy (p. 295).

No wonder Ms. Warren is concerned.

Yet another source of value conflict for the faculty is continuing education, the most recent area of the comprehensive community college to emerge into prominence. As newcomers to any already established social institution or organization, continuing education has suffered its own criticisms. While that much was expected, the intensity behind the criticisms was not. Some of the criticisms of continuing education which I heard on the campuses visited were non-professional and more emotional than rational.

For example, at a midwestern community college, an otherwise gentlemanly vice-president for academic affairs referred to the continuing education people on his campus as "academic pond scum;" a dean for student services at a northern community college said that continuing education people are "...those guys who work out of the trunk of their car." Few spoke well of continuing education except the presidents who praised continuing education FTE as the savior of their colleges and a few faculty who seemed to grasp the social mission of continuing education. Why does continuing education evolve such emotional responses? The answer is complex and begins with the historical development of continuing education.

Hankin and Fey (1985) have traced the development of continuing education in the community college movement. During the 1920s and 1930s, continuing education was not a part of the junior college.

The first mention of it as an important function of the community college was in 1931 in W. C. Eell's The Junior College. In 1934, the Junior College Journal contained an editorial which encouraged development of continuing education services. In 1935, continuing education programs were encouraged at the annual meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges (pp. 154-155).

However, little was done to develop continuing education because the emphasis and enrollment was in transfer programs and because external monies were not available to fund continuing education programs. Continuing education grew into its own during the fourth generation when the comprehensive community college concept coincided with the availability, in some states, of funding for FTE. Hankin and Fey (1985) report 3,724,529 people served during the 1983-1984 year and project over six million by the year 2000.

It is numbers such as these that led Nespoli and Martorana (1983-1984) to state that continuing education has become an accepted part of the community college philosophy; for them, the remaining question "...is not whether the community college should or should not have these programs, but who should pay for them" (p. 5). Breneman and Nelson (1981) argue, however, that the case for state support for most continuing education courses is not strong (p. 23).

Several criticisms of continuing education argue against state support and, at the same time, explain why the traditional credit faculty is alienated. While the following discussion of the criticisms of continuing education comes from a survey of the literature, they, in various forms, cover the comments made by those I interviewed and, in addition, have been heard on Cecil's campus.

A major criticism of continuing education is the relationship between credit faculty and those who are hired to teach continuing education courses. Beatty (1980) says that the foundation of a community college is the credit faculty who play a decisive role in whether or not continuing education is fully accepted on campus (p. 49). Yet, Cohen (1983) reports that continuing education programs historically have been developed and/or taught without involvement of the credit faculty (p. 171). Instead of hiring proven faculty with academic credentials, continuing education administrators hire people who have never or seldom taught, or they hire adjunct faculty with some credentials but little, if any, teaching experience (Cohen, 1983, p. 171). Some community colleges even hire continuing education instructors who lack both credentials and teaching experience.

Thus, many faculty are led to believe that the goal of continuing education is not to provide quality instruction but instead "...choices are being made and directions set in order to address immediate pressures and constraints" (Green, 1985, p. 294). For Cohen (1984), then, the result of such hiring practices is internal dissension over institutional credibility:

> Faculty members trying to maintain collegiate standards in their courses certainly take a dim view of most continuing education activities. Correspondingly, most continuing education proponents find little place for the regular faculty members in their programs, preferring instead to staff them with part-timers working ad hoc with little or no commitment to the institution itself. Continuing education has thus fostered internal dissension (pp. 274-275).

Thus, although large enrollments in continuing education programs give the "illusion" of success (Atwell, Vaughan and Sullins, 1982),

such success may be at the price of internal harmony. Ignoring the credit faculty in hiring practices, and offering some continuing education courses in direct competition with credit courses, have divided the college community, according to Bennett, El-Khawas and O'Neil (1985):

> ...within a college, excessive competition or a narrowness of vision among constituent departments detracts from the underlying unity. Beyond some point, that unity is broken or stretched so thin that internal efficiency and external identity is lost (p. 13; emphasis added).

Thus, not only do credit faculty appear to be confused and angry over the role of continuing education on their campuses, the external identity of the college is put in question. For Cohen (1983), "the public tends to perceive continuing education as evidence that the community college is not serious about education" (p. 170). Part of the lack of understanding by the public over the role of continuing education is because community colleges have not done a good job of convincing the public of its success in educating individual credit students. Thus, it is even more difficult for community colleges to demonstrate their success in uplifting entire communities.

Among other reasons the public does not understand continuing education is because it does not understand the distinction between higher education and postsecondary education. Of course, it can be added that many faculty do not understand the distinction either. Since continuing education does not offer any courses for academic credit, it is always postsecondary, never higher education. Post-secondary programs can, and should be, a vital component in the mission of a comprehensive community college. However, the

distinction between higher education and postsecondary education needs to be made clear, especially in planning and budgeting, for both the general public and the faculty.

Yet the conflict is greater than just one of definitions. Knoell (1983) states:

> When both functions - postsecondary and higher education - are commingled, the potential for conflict rises especially when the demand for continuing education increases to a point where it dominates other programs (p. 35).

It is this last point, the shifting of funds from credit programs to continuing education programs, that most outraged the people interviewed. Academic administrators, confused about the role of continuing education, and credit faculty, anxious about their jobs, are angered over continuing education obtaining funding previously budgeted for credit programs. Hence, they responded with emotional outbursts. While their mode of responding is neither acceptable, nor productive, the intensity speaks to a serious problem. The problem may be that in the community college clambering for FTE, "...it is easier to propose new roles, such as continuing education, than it is to explain away their inability to fulfill old ones" (Cohen, 1984, p. 274).

In addition, the role of continuing education is perceived by many local community agencies as a competitor who "...may not take kindly to the intrusion" (Cohen, 1983, p. 172). The community college is a college, not a social welfare agency, and should leave those functions to the groups that already are dealing with them, according to these critics.

Hankin, a community college president, at one time director of continuing education at Harford Community College, states:

> Some feel that the decision to provide a specific course or service is based on little more than the hunch of some staff member, that any expressed need or interest often triggers the launching of a program whether or not it has long-range value, and that such programs or courses are planned hit-or-miss or are based on ability to enroll numbers of students and generate state aid rather than around some organizing principle. Few programs have built-in programs of evaluation (Hankin and Fey, 1985, p. 158; emphasis added).

The remedy for Hankin and Fey (1985) is the "...development and articulation of a systematic set of values..." which will guide continuing education (p. 161). So, in answer to the emotional responses heard on my visits, Hankin and Fey bring reason to the discussion on continuing education.

Continuing education can, and should, fill a major role in a community college. The issue is not the importance of the role of continuing education but is instead lack of articulation of that role supported by sound educational values. The need for postsecondary education for adult workers who need new skills, plus lifelong learning for an aging population who face adjustment for retirement and who need leisure activities, could make continuing education a viable and socially relevant aspect of the community college mission.

But the mission, Hankin and Fey (1985) state, must be one which centers on "...a fundamental set of values" (p. 161). The colleges visited, despite the residue of emotional outbursts from some individuals, have developed a set of values which place continuing education within the role of the college. Possibly this should be a major focus at Cecil.

## IV. Observations and Suggestions for Faculty Concerns

1. The keys to a positive working relationship between faculty and administrators are mutual trust and respect. Usually these factors are measured informally, i.e., word of mouth, and/or attendance and cooperation on committees and at social events. In addition to these informal measures, some of the colleges visited have established yearly objective measures of trust and respect. Each administrator is evaluated by subordinates; the president is evaluated by the entire faculty.

Taking such a step shows openness for constructive criticism on the part of those administrations and provides a means for their faculty to voice their concerns, yet remain anonymous if they so choose. After the evaluations, feedback is provided on the results and what actions will be taken to address the major concerns, if any.

2. Too large a percentage of the faculty in community colleges are labeled as stagnant either by administrators, fellow faculty, and/or self report. Several steps have been taken by the colleges visited to overcome this stagnation. Those steps are as follows:

a. Aging faculty are teaching aging students. Both as faculty and as individuals, i.e., for purposes of teaching and personal growth, faculty need to become aware of current theories and research on adult development. The works of Erikson, Levinson, Gould, Gilligan, Schlossberg, and Lee among others, might help faculty become more aware of changes in their personal priorities and those in the lives of their students.

b. Much of the disillusionment of faculty is caused by their sense of helplessness in teaching poorly qualified students. The clash of values over how they were taught and learned versus the skills and non-academic priorities of their students leads many faculty to despair over the future of higher education and the importance of their teaching. A large part of this disillusionment is caused by a lack of understanding of the needs of poorly prepared students and how to teach them. The first step is for the faculty to believe that they should be teaching basic skills. The second step is for the administration to make this issue a high priority. Then, all faculty (full and adjunct) could be trained in the teaching of critical thinking skills and basic skills (reading and writing) and might be required to teach those skills in their discipline.

c. Some colleges have instituted a "needs improvement" contract for faculty. Major weaknesses are identified, a plan to improve is developed and the instructor is given two years to improve. If significant improvement is not made, the individual is dismissed.

d. Two colleges established mini-grants for faculty development. The grants, ranging from $100 to $500, were competitive with the process for applying similar to Cecil's self-initiated release time process, i.e., applications were evaluated by fellow faculty. Proposals could be submitted for any project that directly related to their teaching discipline. The development activities were included in the yearly faculty evaluation.

e. Believing that professional faculty development is crucial to improving faculty morale, and that the key to faculty

development is a system of rewards and recognition, one college provides professional development monies ($500 per instructor per academic year) to be used as the faculty member wishes as long as improvement in teaching is the goal. Examples of how the monies have been used are purchase of professional books and journals, memberships in professional organizations, purchase of a PC for office use, travel to conventions, workshops and conferences.

f. Another college developed an internship program for faculty to became involved in their fields of expertise with local businesses, hospitals, public schools, social service agencies, etc. Release time was given, for example, for a computer program instructor to work for a semester at a local business which was developing a computer system for billing customers and maintaining inventory. The instructor was "doing" in addition to teaching and returned to the classroom with renewed energy, plus practical examples for his students.

3. None of the colleges visited required more than two duty days for faculty when classes were not in session; most required only a general faculty meeting the day before the Fall semester. In place of duty days, seminars and in-service workshops were scheduled at set times (usually Wednesday afternoons) during regular semesters. Events were scheduled about twice a month and attendance was required.

4. Both in the literature and from my conversations with faculty members, it is clear that faculty are shifting their loyalties from their college to their discipline. One English faculty member told

me that he no longer believed in the administration of his school ( a large community college in the South) but he still believed in the scholarly rigor of literary criticism, his academic specialty, and had shifted the extra time he had spent on committee work to additional class preparation in that area. However, loyalty to a discipline, even at the expense of the institution, is not necessarily a negative characteristic. This English instructor, even disgruntled, is probably a better classroom teacher. The key, of course, is for an institution to strike a balance with its faculty: service to the college and loyalty to the discipline. When loyalties shift significantly toward disciplines, morale problems may be one of the causes.

5. Most colleges ask the following question on student evaluations: "Would you recommend this professor?"

6. A large factor in being a team member is feeling welcome. Most of the colleges had a well-developed orientation plan for new faculty (and other personnel as well) where a "buddy" was assigned to help the newcomer with any questions.

7. Because teaching was the prime reason for existence at each of these schools and the library was considered "the heart of the college," library budgets were not cut during times of fiscal difficulties.

8. Also, because of the importance of teaching, finalists for teaching positions (full and adjunct) were required to teach a demonstration lecture before the search committee and other members of the discipline. Finalists were allowed to select the topic and to teach it in the manner he/she normally would present the material.

9. To incorporate adjunct faculty into the academic atmosphere of the campus and to make them feel part of the team, one college prepared a special newsletter twice a year for adjunct faculty and awarded a Distinguished Service Award annually to an adjunct faculty member. This award was not the same as teacher-of-the-year, but recognized long service, special projects, innovative class methods, etc.

10. Each of the colleges had experienced difficulty with quality of instruction in continuing education classes. While at one time, most of the colleges had a separate division for continuing education, now most of the colleges incorporated continuing education under academic instruction, a recommendation made for Cecil by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Also, to provide quality control in instruction, credit faculty were given first choice for teaching non-credit classes. Finally, continuing education did not duplicate credit courses; the rationale that their students are somehow different than credit students has not been supported by data.

11. Most of the colleges prepared a statement of student expectations, i.e., knowledge, abilities, skills, students could expect to learn by the time they had earned an Associate in Arts degree. These expectations were an elaboration of the college's values and mission statement. In each course the student was presented with a statement of expectations for that course which was correlated with the expectations for graduation. In this way, each course was part of an overall plan to develop skills for students leading up to graduation.

12. None of the colleges had a policy similar to our 15.5 policy. For them, the effectiveness of a faculty member was not measured prior to teaching or based upon enrollment, but was measured by the effectiveness of their teaching. A "success rate" measure was used at two colleges. Faculty were evaluated by a rate of retention (figured on average retention rates per discipline/course for the past three-five years).

For example, if in the past three years, 80% of students completed introductory philosophy courses (I and W counted as non-completion, F as completion), then the philosophy faculty were evaluated as to their ability to retain students at the 80% "success rate." At the same time, attention was paid to avoid grade inflation and/or the setting of minimum requirements to keep students in a class.

13. As a corollary to the above point, the colleges paid as much attention to the number of students who completed courses at the end of the semester as to the number who enrolled. "Making our FTE" was balanced with "retaining our FTE." Student, faculty and college goals were measured in completion rates. For example, 1000 students registered for the fall semester and 850 successfully completed courses (W, I, and F grades counted as nonsuccessful).

14. One school established a separate testing center where students could go to take exams under security controls. Faculty had more class time to teach and students were given a time period to complete exams.

## V. Review of the Literature on Developmental Education

With enrollments leveling off or declining, it has become clear that keeping students is at least as important as attracting them in the struggle to maintain full-time equivalents (Zwerling, 1980, p. 55; emphasis added). However, virtually all programs designed to reduce attrition have focused on what it is assumed students lack, i.e., dropouts are considered different from persisters. Now it is necessary to shift the focus from what is wrong with the student to what is wrong with the institution. The problem of retention is most critical for the small, rural community college.

Sullins and Atwell (1986) question whether the small, rural community college is an "endangered species." Yet for twenty-five percent of our nation's population, their local community college may be their only available source of higher education. Further, the standards of productivity used by external accrediting and governing agencies are inappropriate for the small rural college.

Using minimum class size and the number of graduates per program as standards reflects a lack of understanding of the mission of the rural community college, i.e., to serve the educational needs of local citizens (Sullins and Atwell, 1986, p. 46). On the other hand, the authors faulted the rural community college for lacking a systematic effort to implement innovative programs; all too often, they assert, the emphasis is on funding not upon the mission. For them, "mission follows funding," a frequent complaint of community colleges found in the literature.

Miller (1985) proposes that the decline in traditional-aged college students forced community colleges to enroll students who historically would not have been qualified for admission. For Miller, economic factors are the root of lower academic standards (p. 161). He further states that as the quality and the credibility of a college degree continues to decline in the public's opinion, rural colleges which serve a narrow constituency will suffer the most (p. 160).

For Litten (1980), marketing can play a central role in reaching rural citizens and making them aware of the services available at their local community college; the key is on services, not on information. Litten (1980) states:

> ...marketing is more than mere institutional presentation and the generation of information. It is also the development and delivery of educational and auxiliary services for which there is desire or need or, preferably, both, at a price and under financing arrangements that permit the intended beneficiaries to take advantage of the services (p.43).

For Litten, "positioning" must fit the college's mission.

Martin (1985), in fact, believes that a good mission statement is as important to a college as is good management; indeed, for Martin, management should be guided by the mission statement, not vice versa (p. 41). The mission should be the "bible" by which educational decisions, policies and procedures are made.

However, Martin asserts that the real definition of mission is intangible, i.e., the "college culture" which underlines the institution. For example, what are the commonly held values and standards of a college; what does a particular college <u>really</u> stand

for? Martin states that "...every strong college will have beliefs that stand as foundations on which the mission statements are built" (p. 54). A strong college has a distinctive mission and will not allow anything to interrupt that mission. Martin is suggesting that if a college does not know itself, it will not be successful in marketing its services to potential students or to its own employees.

By positioning, a rural community college can provide either a relatively unique set of services or help serve a relatively large clientele who are not being served by other institutions.

> If these unoccupied positions are combined with ...a concern for the educational and social desirability of meeting the demands that they represent, diversity can be developed with integrity to the benefits of both individuals and society (Martin, 1985, p. 44).

Part of positioning is knowing the market. The market, even in a rural area, is segmented, i.e., potential students are not all alike, nor do they have the same objectives or concerns. Certainly they do not have the same perceptions and preferences for higher education. The most effective marketing, Martin (1985) believes, is that which is targeted to an intended audience (p. 45). In addition, part of marketing is to make clear the institution's expectations of students.

One of the problems with marketing is that while it usually is targeted to specific groups, such as transfer and career students, a significant percentage of community college students are developmental. Colleges do not market to this group, often because it

could make them appear "less than a college" to do so. Also, developmental students often do not want to be reminded of what they already know. However, since developmental education is a significant component of a college's mission, and is the group with the highest rate of attrition, increasing retention by the combined efforts of realistic marketing, realistic expectations and realistic programs can serve the dual purpose of meeting needs and of maintaining enrollment. Unfortunately, the task is made difficult by the evasive nature of the developmental student.

Cross (1976) defines the "new student" as "...those scoring in the lowest third among national samples of young people on traditional tests of academic ability" (p. 13). They are the children of blue-collar families whose parents never attended college and probably never graduated from high school (see note 4); thus the expectations of college are new to them, even, in fact, alien. The lack of homework in high school during the past decade has widened the gap between study skills needed to succeed in high school and the ones that are required in college (Bell, 1984, p. 15).

McCabe and Skidmore (1983), in a survey of community college students, found that fewer than half the students reported using a library more than five times in high school or taking more than five essay tests; less than one in six reported being required to read more than fifty pages a week in high school (p. 63). Is it any

surprise then that these students did not expect greater demands when they entered the community college?

Since they have not been successful in high school, why do they attend the community college? They enroll because they believe society's message that education is the way to a better job, better money and a better life than that of their parents. The community college is the only educational opportunity available for them. Unfortunately, they are not even prepared to succeed at the community college and often drop out before the community college developmental program might have been able to produce results. Clark's (1960) concept of the "cooling out" process explains the institution's insidious role in the dropping out of developmental students.

Cross (1976) maintains that community colleges fail these students because community colleges are not prepared to, and, in many cases, do not want to, educate them. One error has been to attempt to make "new students" over into the image of traditional students, so they can be served by tradition education, i.e., transfer curriculum. Such is not likely to occur.

Griffin (1980) discusses why this "make over" is not successful when he describes the "new student" who attends the community college. They have problems setting priorities and in working toward specific goals because of a generally unfavorable attitude toward education. They tend to place the blame on their academic failures outside themselves, i.e., they feel that success or failure is a function of factors external to them, such as fate or a teacher who dislikes them. They do not feel that they have personal control of

their academic future (p. 17). This attitude may determine the student's long-range academic goals as early as middle school (Alexander, Cook and McDill, 1978, p. 62).

The error of treating a developmental student as a potential transfer student has a long history. For decades the answer to the question who should go to college was simple: those who could afford it and who needed it for their station in life. This aristocratic philosophy was replaced with the founding of land-grant universities where the emphasis was on merit, that is, college admission should be for those who have the willingness to study and who have showed the academic ability to profit from a college education. Higher education had become an earned right, not a birthright. However, the curriculum still was designed for the academically elite.

In 1947, the President's Commission on Higher Education for American Democracy (known as the Truman Commission) estimated that forty-nine percent of the nation's population could profit from at least two years of postsecondary education and thirty-two percent of this group had the capacity to earn a four-year degree. The Commission, thus, proposed a network of locally controlled colleges which would place higher education within commuting distance of a majority of Americans (Vaughan, 1983, p. 6). Community colleges, now had a governmental mandate to reach out to new populations.

In the 1950s, meritocracy reached its peak, just prior to the founding of hundreds of community colleges. Wolfe (1954) summarizes the prevailing attitude of the time:

> The democratic ideal is one of equal opportunity; within that ideal it is both individually advantageous and socially desirable for each person to make the best

> possible use of his talents. But equal opportunity does not mean equal accomplishments or identical use. Some men have greater ability than others and can accomplish things which are beyond the powers of men of lesser endowment...The nation needs to make effective use of its intellectual resources. To do so means to use well its brightest people whether they come from farm or city, from the slum section or the county club area, regardless of ability (p. 6; emphasis added).

By the early 1970s, the question facing educators was no longer who is qualified for college admission, but how higher education, in particular community colleges, could change to meet the needs of all who wished to attend. The answer to the question who should be educated, had gone from the aristocratic "elite" to the egalitarian "everyone." Now the prevailing attitude, made possible by the existence of over 1200 community colleges, is that anyone who wants to pursue higher education should be able to do so, regardless of economic resources and regardless of past academic achievement. Enter the "new student" into the local community college.

The results are obvious. Roueche (1978) states that by 1968, the most offered courses in community colleges were remedial English, reading and mathematics. But, he states, the courses did not "remedy" student learning difficulties. In fact, according to his data, most students never completed the remedial courses in which they were enrolled. Only ten percent of all remedial students returned for a second semester (p. 28). It could be argued, however, that when community colleges first entered into developmental education, many of those faculty may not have been trained specifically to work with those students.

Nevertheless, in the late 1970s and the early 1980s, when community colleges opened the door, they had the field to themselves, and the money and students to be successful. At that time, four-year colleges were not interested in competing for developmental students. "Community colleges didn't have to prove they could do the job better than other colleges; they just had to express a willingness to do the job that society wanted done" (Cross, 1981, p. 121).

Now, however, with four-year colleges establishing developmental programs (see note 5) and openly recruiting developmental students, community colleges must prove they are better at developmental education. Finn (1984), a strong critic of higher education, faults four-year colleges for doing "...practically anything to lure warm, tuition-paying bodies into their classrooms" (p. 30) (see note 6).

It appears, therefore, that the confidence community colleges have in their ability to provide better developmental education than four-year colleges rests not on proven results but on a false confidence from not having any competition early in the game (see note 7). While it is true that community colleges have more experience than most other institutions with developmental education, research indicates that the community colleges do not have much confidence in their ability to know what they are doing.

In a survey of eighteen community colleges, developmental education was one of the major dissatisfactions for administrators and faculty (Cross, 1981, p. 117). According to her research, we are not doing what we say we are with developmental education. What

appears to be occurring in place of quality developmental education is the emphasis upon enrollments in developmental education to maintain the FTE; namely, to get them in and count them as FTE is more important than what happens to them once they are in. To allow these students to enroll, knowing full well that they will not complete the course is expensive in human terms, psychologically damaging to the student and unethical behavior on the part of the community college.

But the fault does not lie totally with administrators who must manage FTE-driven budgets. Faculty are reluctant to teach low-aptitude students either because they have had no training to do so and/or because they feel it is demeaning to teach lower-than-college-level reading, writing, and mathematics courses (Lombardi, 1979,p. 67). Even among faculty who are sympathetic to the goals of developmental education, slow student progress produces frustration.

Both administrators and faculty are at fault, according to Roueche (1978), who says that most community colleges do not know whether entering students can read and write well enough to pursue college level courses and even fewer colleges know what level of verbal skills are required for success in specific programs (p. 30). Without analysis of placement tests and measurable classroom expectations, academic advising is a guessing game.

Thus, for the critics of community colleges, the promise of open admissions is fraudulent (Karabel, 1972, p. 38) and is under scrunity by several groups. The egalitarian movement which prevailed over

aristocracy and which was the foundation of America's community college movement now is being questioned. The newest voices come from taxpayers asking why they should be paying at least twice for the same developmental education (in secondary school and in the community college) and why students who have shown no indication that they can be educated are at the local community college (Barshis and Guskey, 1983, p. 77).

Because of the taxpayer "revolt," limited economic resources and nationwide criticism of public education, community colleges are shifting from an emphasis on open access to one of educational quality, as if the two concepts are diametrically opposed. However, community colleges do not have to choose between open access and quality. Thompson (1985) states the position well:

> Quality is measured on what is produced, not by whom is admitted. Open admissions is not a measure of quality. Those who complete the program are the yardstick by which the institution is judged (p. 10; emphasis added).

Unfortunately, too many students are graduating from community colleges (and four-year colleges) without adequate basic skills. Consequently, public support diminishes as the public cry for external controls increases (Bennett, El-Khawas and O'Neil, 1985, p. 8).

Barshis and Guskey (1983) list three assumptions underlining most developmental programs in community colleges: (1) inadequately prepared students are educable under the appropriate conditions and can be prepared to learn in college; (2) the appropriate conditions can be provided in an efficient manner with resources available in

the community colleges; and (3) hence, the community college is the most appropriate place for developmental education to occur (p. 79).

On the other hand, combating these idealistic assumptions is the reality of finances. "Most of the pressures on community colleges over developmental education will come from concern over funding" (Barshis and Guskey, 1983, p. 96). Inadequate funding for developmental education is one of the reasons that community colleges have not backed with solid results their claim to being the best at developmental education. Poor assessment instruments, declining resources for testing and counseling, and a weak academic advising system which allows a developmental reading student concurrently to enroll in psychology, history and business law courses, are other weaknesses cited in the literature.

Developmental education has been, and continues to be, one of the least successful college programs in achieving its goals. After more than nearly two decades of effort, no effective method of educating developmental students has been found. Community college developmental programs have little impact on the improvement of writing ability and reading comprehension, while there are improvements in reading rate, vocabulary and coherent writing. Yet without significant improvement in reading comprehension and writing ability, colleges may be faced with higher attrition rates or the necessity of lowering standards (Palmer, 1984, p. 27).

Regardless of their motivation, and the quality of their programs, community colleges will be in the developmental education business for several reasons, according to Donovan (1985). First,

there is little evidence, at this point, that the tightening of high school standards will decrease the number of recent high school graduates who are not prepared for college-level work. Second, with an ever shrinking pool of high school graduates from which to recruit, four-year colleges will not be able to deny admission to the marginally prepared student and will be in direct competition with the community colleges for such students (p. 106).

Some report that developmental student enrollment will reach 50% of the total enrollment in community colleges within the next decade (Lombardi, 1979, p. 71). As the percentage of developmental students increases, community college education will become less collegiate and more postsecondary (Knoell, 1983,p. 27). Perhaps we are already there. At times it appears that we are less a college then we are a learning center with activities for students ranging from grade four to postgraduate school.

Donovan (1985) lists several recommendations to address developmental education. Among them are (1) the creation of interdisciplinary courses designed to promote critical thinking and independent learning; (2) develop community college curriculum in cooperation with local high schools, i.e., Parnell's (1985) "two plus two" concept; and (3) train all faculty in the teaching of basic skills (pp. 124-125).

Two administrative policies have been enacted at various colleges to address the issue of success in developmental education. Knoell (1983) cites the establishment of a level, determined by a placement test, below which developmental education would not be offered; these

students are referred for adult basic education or GED courses. The colleges who have implemented this policy have used local norms gathered over a minimum of a five-year period (p. 32).

Another administrative policy, cited by Rounds and Andersen (1985), is required developmental work combined with required counseling. They report on the developmental program at El Paso Community College where: (1) students were denied entry into classes in which their chances for success were low (based on local norms); (2) students were required to enroll in developmental courses and, if they were unwilling to do so, even after academic counseling, they were not allowed to enroll in college-level courses; and (3) students who did enroll in developmental courses were required to attend individual counseling sessions at least three times a semester.

Ironically, the mission of community colleges to provide developmental education might be in jeopardy from another unexpected source. Historically, the community college has served the children of blue collar workers who lack adequate academic skills for college-level work. But now, Templin (1983) suggests that the relationship among community colleges, minorities and the poor is changing. In 1978, 42% of all Black students and more than one half of all Hispanic and American Indian students in higher education were enrolled in community colleges. But between 1978 and 1980, minority enrollments in community colleges began to decline for the first time. Templin questions if the community college becomes a middle-class college, will it be at the expense of the lower-income, disadvantaged student (p. 48).

He cites two potential problems. One is that postgraduate students seeking technology courses for job skills will be more desirable than developmental students. Developmental students will have to compete not only with recent qualified high school graduates but also with persons already holding college degrees (p. 48). Second, faculty may be tempted to lecture to the more articulate and veteran students holding degrees than to the developmental student. If an increased level of instruction results, it will be even more beyond the comprehension of the developmental student (p. 48).

## VI. Observations and Suggestions on Developmental Education, Retention and Marketing

1. The reading level of each textbook in each class could be determined and used as an advising tool. If the student's reading placement score (translated into grade reading level) is two or more grades below the text for the course, the student should not be allowed to enroll in the course (see Copperman reference in note 7).

2. A professional counselor should meet with each developmental student at least three times a semester or once for each credit hour, e.g., if the student is carrying six credit hours of developmental work, then he/she must meet with the counselor six times a semester. Hunt, Klieforth and Atwell (1977) suggest that the developmental student must be thoroughly understood as well as thoroughly tested (p. 21). Such has not always been the case.

Beginning in the early 1970s, community college educators rationalized their inability to assess their students accurately by saying that anyone had the right to try anything, even if it meant failure (Cohen, 1984, p. 61). However, Cohen (1984) suggests that when special treatment is applied, e.g., students are given supplemental counseling, tutoring, and learning aids, and are singled out for additional work, they tend to remain in school (p. 234).

3. A limit should be placed on the number of credit hours a developmental student can take. Students with one developmental course might be allowed to enroll for twelve hours; with two

developmental courses, nine hours; with three developmental courses, enroll only for those courses. In addition, control could be exercised over which "regular" courses a student could take.

4. All students who work twenty or more hours a week should be limited in the number of credit hours they can attempt unless past academic work warrants it.

5. Students should be allowed to register the same day they take placement tests. Advising services, with placement test results, could be available. Too many students take the placement tests and do not return for registration.

6. Administrative withdrawal should be considered (again) for students who miss a certain percent of their classes. A grade of W or F would be assigned depending upon when in the semester the absences occurred.

7. A study could be done of the retention rate in key courses necessary for employment in particular areas and compared to retention college-wide. Such a study, which would give a realistic retention rate college-wide, might show if students were only taking certain courses for job advancement or whether they were interested in a degree. Such research also might show if students stopped attending a class after they had obtained the specific skills needed for job advancement. This might be true particularly in computer processing courses.

It is no longer valid to assume that students stop attending a course because they are failing. Friedlander (1980) states that the objectives students have for taking a course are not necessarily the

same as those the instructor established for teaching the course (p. 60). Students use community colleges for their own purposes and frequently achieve those purposes short of course completion (Cohen, 1984, p. 57). Therefore, some students may achieve their objectives without completing the course and that knowledge could be a factor in how and when Cecil offers certain courses.

8. Students on academic restriction could be required to attend a one or two hour, group counseling session on study habits prior to enrolling for the next semester. If they do not attend, they cannot register for the next semester.

9. On a pilot basis, Cecil could provide Cognitive Style Mapping for faculty and for a sample of students by matching their cognitive style (their best mode of learning, i.e. lecture, discussion or a combination) with a similar mode of instruction. "Students have different learning styles and the college that responds best to the needs of its particular students is likely to do better in some pragmatic ways, i.e. admissions, retention and development" (Levine, 1985, p. 131).

10. An Early Warning System could be adopted by which faculty provide both attendance and performance data for the first four weeks of the semester. Computer-generated letters (one for low attendance, another for poor performance) would be sent out from student services suggesting an appointment with a counselor or the faculty advisor.

11. One college has lectures on both video and audio tape for students who miss a class or who wish to review. The video tapes must be used in the LRC, but the audio tapes could be checked out overnight.

12. Develop a clear, consistent, standard format for all course syllabi with clear learning expectations and objectives for the course which are directly related to the college's mission and objectives.

13. One college has textbooks ready and packaged for each student who requests the service at the time of registration. The fee is $5.00 and covers the cost of student workers who match courses for which the student is registered (a copy of the registration form is used) with textbooks. The book packages, labeled with the student's name, can be picked up in the gym up to the end of the first week of class.

14. Two colleges provide all faculty, staff and administrators with an annotated bibliography on retention with periodic updates. They also put "retention tips" in college in-house newsletters.

15. Survey all students who applied and took placement tests, but did not enroll.

16. Survey how many students were able to obtain their first choice of classes and times. Also, survey how many first-year students were exposed to adjunct faculty.

17. Ask the student what he/she expects to receive for his/her time and money. What were their expectations prior to enrolling and after the course was completed?

18. Require developmental education with a well-planned mission and realistic expectations, supported by adequate funding, with a standard (a grade level, not a grade) which must be met before the student is allowed to enroll for college-level classes. Vincennes

University (a two-year college despite its name) uses a grade reading level of 11.6 before a student can exit the developmental reading course. Students have two semesters to obtain that level. Roueche, Baker and Roueche (1985) believe that specific exit standards for developmental courses are a valuable first step in providing stability to such programs (p. 9).

19. Give all students all their grades at mid-term.

20. Prior to preparing the class schedule for the next semester, survey evening students to determine what and when they would like to see offered.

21. At Vincennes University, selected faculty are paid for advising. They believe that the keys to retention in faculty advising are (1) time, rapport and availability of faculty for advising and (2) morale of selected faculty.

22. Have an Alumni/ae of the Month feature in the Cecil Whig.

23. Promote Cecil with a video in addition to, or in place of, the slide presentation.

24. Start low-key recruitment in the middle schools.

25. Use billboards, bumper stickers, etc., to advertise Cecil in an unique way: "Thank you for attending Cecil Community College--your college!" In fact, these could replace the current parking stickers.

26. Prepare video tapes by selected faculty on how to study in college; use the tapes for current students and as a recruitment tool. Such a video tape might also include sample lectures by selected faculty so potential students can see what Cecil is like.

27. Have the public school's College Night on Cecil's campus. It will get parents of prospective students on our campus.

28. Send recruiting letters to parents of prospective students and include testimonials of parents of current students and of graduates.

29. Establish a Sports Hall of Fame of outstanding former Cecil athletes who represent the student-athlete model.

30. Establish a summer camp for high school music students.

31. A major goal of a college must be to understand its public image, uncomfortable as that knowledge might be, and to study the relationship of that image to the college's true mission. However, it is fashionable today for recruitment campaigns to "sell" rather than to "tell." But students are smart consumers and wise to gimmickry. Hence, the slogan used for recruiting must be one which reflects the atmosphere on campus and which is believed in by the college community. So many colleges use "High Quality" that it is overworked to the point of being meaningless. Delta College uses "Touching Your Life"...and they do.

32. Recruit at PTA groups which have a good number of parents who have some college education and might be interested in enrolling.

33. Recruit reverse transfer summer students by buying the mailing list from four-year colleges by home zip codes. Send a letter just before spring break with a summer schedule by direct mail to Cecil county students in four-year colleges . Have registration procedures ready so they may register while home on spring break.

Use testimonials of former students from each college who have taken summer courses at Cecil and transferred them back to their four-year college.

34. Research the profile of students (race, age, sex, socioeconomic status and prior education) to see if the profile is changing from previous years.

35. Cecil might investigate the completion rates of developmental students to assess whether we are doing what we say we are.

## VII. Concluding Remarks

Perhaps community colleges have delivered so little because we promised so much. Our weakness may be more overenthusiasm than misguided mission. In any case, it is clear that community colleges need to re-define their mission, while, at the same time, maintaining their enthusiasm, if we are to survive with dignity. One of the most consistent criticisms of comprehensive community colleges is that we have attempted to do too much, that we have lacked a clear, well-defined mission. Consequently, much has been done, but little of it has been done well. For Breneman and Nelson (1981), the "future of the community college is hard to predict because the range of choices regarding what to emphasize and even what to become is wider for community colleges than for other institutions of higher learning" (p. 24). Hence, clear mission statements, established in open dialogue, must be the top priority.

These choices must be founded upon a system of values which represent the college to itself and to its public. Community colleges need, then, either to formulate a value system or to define our existing values. The colleges I visited had clear, distinct values; they knew who they were and what they were about.

One area for value clarification which must be addressed is the real reason for instruction: is it for learning or is it for enrollment? Community colleges still are organized as if the majority of our students were young, full-time students in transfer programs. Yet, those students no longer are the major population

served by community colleges. By continuing to operate as if they are is either to be grossly unaware of the demographics of the student population and/or is to place higher value on full-time students for economic reasons. Now the major populations served are part-time students who have limited educational objectives, i.e., developmental students and those not interested in transfer.

However, the value community colleges should promote is instruction which produces learning, not curricula built for full-time students and the resulting FTE. Part-time students are as educationally and humanly worthwhile as are full-time students, and add diveristy to a campus, despite the difference in their economical worth as FTEs. Learning should be the intrinsic value in the mission of a community college, not the number of credit hours a student takes. Yet, educational services at most community colleges are geared to full-time students and to FTEs. Hence, community colleges need to re-examine our value systems to include the inherent value of learning per se. The issue should be providing a courseload reasonable for the student's abilities, not one which produces more FTE for the college.

At one community college visited, which was not a League member, faculty advisors were pressured by the administration to encourage students "to take one more course than they had intended;" e.g., a student who had intended to register for six hours was "encouraged" to sign up for nine hours. In fact, at this college, faculty advisors were evaluated, in part, by the number of credit hours their students took. Their real mission, the real importance of

instruction at this college, was "bodies and bucks," not learning. Rhetoric did not match mission. Perhaps it is no accident that the retention rate at this college was less than thirty percent.

Cohen (1984) brings two questions to this discussion. First, he asks of what value is the community college to those people who do not graduate or transfer to a four-year college (p. 64)? Second, he says colleges need to answer who benefits the most from, and who is harmed the most by, colleges which allow all to attend (p. 64)?

The most blatent example from the literature, and from my observations at the colleges visited, of enrollment dominating over learning is continuing education. Here, the call is for a system of values which emphasize learning first, funding second. Hankin and Fey (1985) have asked for "the development and articulation of a systematic set of values (p. 161)" to guide continuing education (see discussion on p. 45). Not only do colleges need to establish their values concerning instruction and continuing education, they need to reconcile these higher education versus postsecondary functions for both their faculty and their public.

A second value issue which must be faced is institutional integrity. Community colleges must get honest and ethical about what we are doing to and for students. For Vaughan (1983),"...community college leaders can rally, regardless of the emphasis on a local campus, around maintaining institutional integrity (p. 12; emphasis added). If we fail to do so, external agencies may force us.

Most developmental education programs are salient examples of the unethical abuse of students for the sake of enrollment. Community colleges promise opportunity for developmental students but fail to

back that promise with adequate staffing, equipment and/or budget to fulfill those promises. The result: broken promises, broken dreams.

Consequently, I anticipate that legal action soon will be taken by developmental students who were promised an improvement in reading level so that they could enroll in college-level courses; or by students who were allowed to enroll concurrently in developmental reading and world history; or who were placed in a course with the reading level of the textbook too many grade levels above their ability. The time has come for community colleges to be honest with themselves and with their public. Again, the same two questions come to mind: "Are we doing what we say we are?" and "What can we do better?" Cecil should answer these questions for our developmental program, as well as for other areas of the college.

In addition, Cecil, as well as our sister community colleges, need to answer the same two questions to resolve the "mission follows funding" issue. We are not being honest with ourselves or with our public when we establish some educational programs, not because of an inherent belief in the value of the program or in our ability to deliver quality education, but enter, instead, into those programs because, first of all, funding is available. In the long run, the public will learn the real motivation behind these programs. The college community probably already knows. I believe that the lack of institutional integrity is one of the major, if not the major, factors behind low faculty morale and stagnant faculty.

Community colleges cannot continue to become more as businesses, i.e., putting the bottom line (FTE) before principles (integrity). If they do so, the faculty-administrator relationship will become less one of friendly opposition and more one resembling labor-management combatants. As community colleges move farther away from the collegiate ideal, faculty will be treated as, and will respond similar to, labor in industry who want job security and a living wage. Nothing more, nothing less. The number of faculty who have "exited" will continue to increase.

However, one gain from such a business-like atmosphere is that internal dissension ceases. Of course, it ceases because faculty no longer care enough about the future of their college to disagree. The "loyal opposition" melts before the more personal concerns of earning a living while seeking professional satisfaction elsewhere. This was exactly the case at one of the non-League colleges visited which was unionized.

Originally, at this college, the faculty unionized about five years ago because they felt that they did not present a unified voice to the administration over their concern about the mission and direction of their college. However, the new purpose of the faculty union quickly became the aggrandizement of faculty concerns over salary and working conditions. The idealist principles of educational quality faded into the distant past. The result was a faculty who worked only to the letter of their negotiated agreement which spelled out in excruciating details such "educational ideals" as the number of office hours, overload pay, criteria for promotions,

etc. In the agreement I read, not a word about mission, nary a mention of educational quality, was found. Incidently, in reaction to the faculty unionizing, the administration formed their own union. Instead of people talking to people, this college had negotiators talking to negotiators. So much for educational progress at this college. When I asked the president of the faculty union, an English professor, if his union was a force on his campus, he answered, " Yes, but I wish we didn't even have to exist!"

Consequently, community colleges need to examine the morale of our faculties and the importance of the faculty in the realm of the college's mission. However, this task is one not only for administrators; the faculty need to clean up their own house.

Stagnant faculty need to be given the opportunity to retire early to seek more personally rewarding careers. At the colleges visited which had early retirement plans, the administration was amazed at the number of faculty who took this option. The stagnant faculty knew they were unhappy and welcomed the opportunity to depart. Not only are the faculty provided financial rewards, but both the college and the individual faculty member also save face.

For those who are not eligible for early retirement, or chose not to take it, colleges should enact a "needs improvement" contract. Faculty who do not show an interest in teaching and who do not keep current in their disciplines have no place in the classroom. They should be dismissed.

Also, when new faculty are hired, faculty search committees should pay as much attention to the values of the applicants as to teaching experience and credentials. The current job market with its surplus of potential college faculty seeking positions is both a blessing and a curse. On one hand, many applicants will apply for community college positions because they see it as a stepping stone to a position in a four-year college; they have no real interest in teaching community college students. But on the other hand, the surplus allows community colleges to hire people who realize the mission of a community college, who want to teach, and who want to teach at a community college.

In addition, the morale of those faculty who remain must be improved. The faculty development activities mentioned earlier as well as building teamwork, offering second-year classes, and training all faculty in skills to teach developmental students, should be explored. At Cecil, the 15.5 policy, long a source of irritation for our faculty, could be replaced with a "success rate" evaluation. In addition, mandatory duty days, of late empty of professional development activities, which require, it appears, the faculty to be on campus simply for the purpose of being on campus, could be replaced with professional development activities during the academic year. Finally, it should be noted that faculty, at Cecil and elsewhere, who have "exited" have done so because their colleges have told them, informally, that such behavior will be tolerated.

Of course, Cecil could be improved, as could any college. But, basically, Cecil is in an envious position compared to most small,

rural community colleges. Cecil has an established President who is respected locally and regionally; a stable, strong core faculty; an excellent working relationship with the local government; and a five-year financial plan which allows for flexibility in educational planning. Cecil is on the cusp of distinction.

Now, then, is the time to move Cecil to the forefront, to exert leadership which will bring us state and national recognition. The President recently launched a "Margin of Excellence" plan to raise money for physical accouterments and educational materials to supplement Cecil's construction plan. I suggest that in conjunction with our "Margin of Excellent" plan, Cecil launch an "Opportunity for Excellence" educational plan. The plan would contain two components: developmental education and critical literacy skills.

All too often for developmental students, failure at the community college confirms their past failures. The cost in human potential is too great to be ignored educationally, economically, and ethically. Cecil possesses the talent and the flexibility to break that chain of failure. We could provide developmental services to young students before the defeatist attitude forms in addition to working with adults to overcome their past failures. The suggestion, made previously in this paper, to offer developmental services to the children of our students is worthy of consideration.

Vaughan (1983) tells us that "...rarely has the community college led broad movements in society or even in individual communities. Rather it has mirrored them (p. 1)." Let Cecil stop mirroring the need for developmental services and begin to change them. Cecil, for

example, could become a leader in the state, even the nation, by being the first, to my knowledge, community college to openly, deliberately recruit developmental students. By matching rhetoric with mission, Cecil could become a clearing house for information on developmental programs. With a new director of developmental education, the time is now to say, and to prove, that Cecil is serious about educating developmental students. Cecil could turn "open access" into "realistic" access.

In essence, Cecil would be doing what no other community college is, i.e., saying that education per se is important at Cecil, that we have made a commitment to educating students who need developmental work, and that we believe developmental education is a major part of our mission in Cecil County. At Cecil, promises would be kept, dreams fulfilled.

In addition, Cecil could take a public stand on the importance of critical literacy. Richardson, Fisk and Okun (1983) reporting on their study at Oakwood Community College, state that:

> Perhaps as a consequence of the priority placed on mission expansion and enrollment growth, Oakwood had no explicit policies on literacy. Specifically, it had not formulated literacy standards for admission or degree completion, instituted substantial procedures to identify and place students needing help with literacy skills, or developed strategies for promoting critical literacy (p. 153).

Cecil could be the first to emphasize that we place more value on transferable skills than on transferable credits. For Bennett and Peltason (1985), if colleges do not themselves set standards for their graduates, "...public support will diminish and there will be a

renewed emphasis on external mandates and controls (p. 8)." Let Cecil set the standards for critical literacy and exit skills for our graduates before they are imposed upon us.

The prestige of a college degree (from both community and four-year colleges) currently is so low, the value of a degree so suspect, I believe the day is not far off when prospective employers will test job applicants for general reading, math and English skills, in addition to the content area necessary for employment. What will be of prime importance, in my opinion, to the employer in the near future will be thinking skills, the ability to reason, not paper credentials. These skills will be especially important with the rapid advancement of technology and learning which makes the content skills and specific knowledge taught in college obsolete within a matter of years. The employee, who cannot think, who cannot learn new skills, will be either dismissed or confined to menial jobs.

Consequently, I believe that our society is in the process of creating a new social/occupational class system: those who can think and those who cannot. This distinction will replace the current distinction between prospective employees with college degrees versus those without college degrees, which replaced the one between those with high school degrees and those without.

Alfred (1984) speaks to the benefits of establishing standards for critical literacy and for graduation:

> The capacity to demonstrate "uniqueness" is directly related to the ability of the institution to report data about <u>student outcomes</u>, <u>social and economic</u>

> impacts and the cost-benefits of educational programs and service for specific constituencies. In the absence of such data, "perceptual" or subjective arguments can be made for uniqueness; arguments that can be made by any unit of postsecondary education thereby rendering inadequate the concept of "uniqueness" in budgetary decisions (p. 5; emphasis added).

Alfred (1984) expands the importance of "uniqueness" to marketing:

> New strategies for marketing college programs and services should be developed with a focus on research data gathered about student outcomes, social and economic impacts and cost-benefits. Information about outcomes is a powerful tool in marketing when compared to routine information about institutional intentions, course offerings and academic services (p. 7; emphasis added).

Thus, Cecil can forge a strong identity as the college which teaches critical literacy skills to all students. Our emphasis could be on preparing self-directed learners who can respond to rapid changes in their jobs or who enter a four-year college with transferable skills. To prospective employers, an Associate in Arts degree from Cecil would have more meaning than degrees from other colleges because our degree has measurable standards of academic achievement.

By guaranteeing the exit skills of its students, Cecil would be taking a major step toward renewing the public's confidence in higher education in general and toward community colleges in particular.

Let the death knell ring for others.

## VIII. Footnotes

1. Despite their dissatisfaction with their current positions, faculty members remain in their jobs, denying entrance to younger and perhaps more energetic instructors. The percentage of faculty who have taught for eleven or more years at the same college increased from 17% in 1975 to 54% in 1983 (Brawer, 1984, p. 15).

2. Clerical staff apparently believed that, as a visitor to their campus, I could not hear them speak. They talked to each other openly in front of me. One went so far as to complain to her counterpart that "...all these out-of-town people are taking up too much of Dr. Smith's time."

3. Before maintaining standards, some faculty must first establish them. Cohen and Brawer (1981), reporting a national study of community college faculty in the humanities and the sciences, found that students were required to read 300-400 pages a semester (less than thirty pages a week), fewer than a third of the faculty required additional readings on outside reference materials and fewer than a third required term papers (p. 63).

4. The predominance of students from lower-middle and lower-class families is being balanced in recent years by an influx of middle-class students. Templin (1983) says that community colleges are becoming predominantly middle-class institutions because of (1) the growth in continuing education programs; (2) an increase of students with bachelor and master degrees; (3) the growth of

high-technology programs; and (4) the increase of tuition at private colleges and public universities are sending these potential students to the community college which has articulation agreements with the eventual degree granting colleges (p. 41-44).

5. The term "developmental education" gained prominence in the 1970s and is derived from Carl Roger's "whole person" concept (Barshis and Guskey, 1983, p. 76). The first developmental education program was established at Wellesley College in 1894 (Kraetsch, 1980, p. 18).

6. The open competition for students has lowered the level of public trust and respect with which higher education has always been held (Bennett, El-Khawas, and O'Neil, 1985, p. 8).

7. For example, it is much easier to rationalize students who drop out or who "stop out" as taking time off to find themselves than it is to confront the limitations of the college which sends these students away (Astin, 1983, p. 127).

In response to lowered faculty standards and to lowered reading skills of students, college textbook publishers are publishing books with lowered reading levels. Copperman (1978) says that publishers cannot sell textbooks written at a readability level higher than two years below the grade for which it is intended (p. 81).

McCabe (1985) suggests that many of the faculty themselves do not have the academic background to grade essays or the reading comprehension skills to teach their students in these areas (p. 90). He could have added administrators to the list. Further, McCabe suggests that faculty adjust downward course assignments to accommodate those who work and attend part time (p. 92).

Cohen (1984) places part of the blame for less-than-college level instruction on the prevalence of nonprint modes of communication.

> "The belief that a person unschooled in the classics was not sufficiently educated died hard in the nineteenth century; the ability to read anything is suffering a similar fate in an era when most messages are carried by wires and waves (p. 26, emphasis in the original).

# IX. Appendix I

## Community Colleges Visited

Cumberland Community College, Vineland, New Jersey

*Brookdale Community College, Lincroft, New Jersey

*Monroe Community College, Rochester, New York

Luzerne County Community College, Nanticoke, Pennsylvania

*Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana

*Moraine Valley Community College, Palos Hills, Illinois

*Delta College, University Center, Michigan

*Piedmont Virginia Community College, Charlottesville, Virginia

Sandhills Community College, Carthage, North Carolina

*Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, North Carolina

*Santa Fe Community College, Gainesville, Florida

Edison Community College, Fort Meyers, Florida

*member, League for Innovation

## Appendix II

### Materials Read Prior to Visit to Each College

1. Report by regional accreditation association
2. Two catalogues; current and one from five years ago
3. Long-Range Plan
4. Policies and Procedures Manual
5. Faculty Handbook (full and adjunct)
6. In-house newsletters
7. Brochures
8. Marketing and recruiting plan

## X. Selected Bibliography

Alba, Richard D. and David E. Lavin. "Community Colleges and Tracking in Higher Education." Sociology of Education, 1981, 54: (October): 223-237.

Alexander, Karl L., Martha Cook and Edward L. McDill. "Curriculum Tracking and Educational Stratification: Some Further Evidence." American Sociological Review, 1978, 43 (February): 47-66.

Alfred, Richard L. "Paradox for Community Colleges: Education in the '80s." Community College Review, 1984, Summer, 12 (1): 2-6.

Astin, Alexander W. "College Dropouts: A National Profile." ACE Research Reports, 7(1). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1972.

Astin, Alexander W. "Strengthening Transfer Programs." in George B. Vaughan. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Atwell, C. A., Vaughan, G. B., and Sullins, W. R. Reexamining Community Services in the Community College: Toward Consensus and Commitment. Topical paper no. 76. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1982.

Barshis, Donald E. and Thomas R. Guskey. "Providing Remedial Education." in George B. Vaughan. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Beatty, Paulette T. "A Case for Instructional Improvement Programs in Community Services." Community College Review, 1980, Fall, 8(2): 45-49.

Bell, Clayton. "Grades as a Predictor of Attrition." Community College Review, 1984, Fall, 12(2): 13-19.

Bennett, John B., Elaine H. El-Khawas and Robert M. O'Neil. "Self-Regulation Within Postsecondary Education." in John B. Bennett and J. W. Peltason (editors). Contemporary Issues in Higher Education: Self-Regulation and the Ethical Roles of the Academy. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1985.

Bennett, John B. and J. W. Peltason (editors). Contemporary Issues in Higher Education: Self-Regulation and the Ethical Roles of the Academy. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1985.

Boshier, Roger. "Educational Participation and the Dropout: A Theoretical Model," Adult Education, 1973, 23(4): 255-282.

Boshier, Roger. "Motivational Orientations Re-visited: Life-Space Motives and the Education Participation Scale." Adult Education, 1977, 27(2): 89-115.

Botstein, Leon. "Leadership: Golden Rules of Practice." in Janice S. Green and Arthur Levine, Opportunity in Adversity: How Colleges Can Succeed in Hard Times. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Brawer, Florence B. "A Longitudinal Analysis of Community College Humanities Faculty." Community College Review, 1984, Summer, 12(1): 14-20.

Breneman, David W. and Susan C. Nelson. "The Future of Community Colleges." Change, 1981, 13(5): 17-25.

Buchanan, III, E. T. and Samuel H. Lamb, II. "Legal Rights Related to Student Progress Through Postsecondary Education." Community College Review, 1980, Fall, 8(2): 41-44.

Butler, Thomas E. "Doing More with Less: Is It Worth the Price?" Community College Review, 1984, Fall, 12(2): 43-48.

Case, Chester H. "Supporting Faculty Leadership for Change." in William L. Deegan and Dale Tillery (editors), Renewing the American Community College: Priorities and Strategies for Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Case, Chester H. "Reformulating General Education Programs." in George B. Vaughan, Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Caswell, Jackie Moe. "Low Cost/High Value Staff Development Program." Community College Review, 1983, 11(1): 21-26.

Clark, B. R. "The 'Cooling-Out' Function in Higher Education." American Journal of Sociology, 1960, 65(6): 569-576.

Clark, B. The Distinctive College: Antioch Reed and Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Maintaining Perspective." Community College Review, 1981, Spring, 8(4): 5-11.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Leading the Educational Program." in George B. Vaughan, Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Cohen, Arthur M. and F. B. Brawer. "Instructional Practices in the Humanities and Sciences." in Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Elizabeth C. Fisk, and Morris A. Okun, Literacy in the Open-Access College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers,1983.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. "The Community College as College: Should the Liberal Arts Survive in Community Colleges?" Change, 1982, March, 14(2): 39-42.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. "Focus on Today's Humanities Instructors," Community College Review, 1977, Spring, 4(4): 51-57.

Copperman, P. The Literacy Hoax: The Decline of Reading, Writing, and Learning in the Public Schools and What we Can Do About It. New York: Morrow, 1978.

Cross, K. Patricia. "Determining Missions and Priorities for the Fifth Generation," in William L. Deegan and Dale Tillery (editors), Renewing the American Community College: Priorities and Strategies for Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Cross, K. Patricia. Beyond the Open Door: New Students to Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Cross, K. Patricia. "Community Colleges on the Plateau," Journal of Higher Education, 1981, 52(2): 113-123.

Crossland, Fred E. and Carol Frances. "Learning to Cope with a Downward Slope: Preparing for the 1980s," Change, 1980, July/August, 12(5): 18-25.

Cruise, Robert J., Lyndon G. Furst, and Rudolf E. Klimes. "A Comparison of Full-time and Part-time Instructors at Midwestern Community College." Community College Review, 1980, Summer, 8(1): 52-56.

Deegan, William L. and Dale Tillery. Renewing the American Community College: Priorities and Strategies for Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Deegan, William L., Dale Tillery and Rudy J. Melone. "The Process of Renewal: An Agenda for Action.: in William L. Deegan and Dale Tillery, Renewing the American Community College: Priorities and Strategies for Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Dennison, John D. "The Search for Parity of Esteem and Status," Community College Review, 1984-1985, Winter, 12(3): 57-63.

Devall, W. B. "Community Colleges: A Dissenting View," Educational Record, 1968, 49(2): 168-171.

Donovan, Richard A. "Creating Effective Programs for Developmental Education." in William L. Deegan and Dale Tillery. Renewing the American Community College: Priorities and Strategies for Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Eckland, B. K. "Social Class and College Graduation: Some Misconceptions Corrected." American Journal of Sociology, 70(July): 36-50, 1964.

Finn, Jr., Chester E. "Trying Higher Education: An Eight Count Indictment." Change, 1984, May/June, 16(4): 28-51.

Freedman, Morris. "The Decline of the Faculty: Mandarins, Carpetbaggers and Zombies." Change, 1980, July/August, 12(5): 7, 48-49.

Friedlander, Jack. "The Problem of Withdrawal from College Credit Courses." Community College Review, 1980, Summer, 8(1): 57-66.

Friedlander, Jack. "An ERIC Review: Why is Transfer Education Declining?" Community College Review, 1980, 8:59-66.

Gaff, Jerry G. "Faculty: Ongoing Development and Renewal." in Janice S. Green and Arthur Levine. Opportunity in Adversity: How Colleges Can Succeed in Hard Times. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Gilley, J. Wade, Kenneth A. Fulmer and Sally J. Reithlingshoefer. Searching for Academic Excellence: Twenty Colleges and Universities on the Move and Their Leaders. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1986.

Graham, Steve and Duane Anderson. "Sources of Financing for Community Colleges." Community College Review, 1985, Summer, 13(1): 50-56.

Green, Janice S. and Arthur Levine. Opportunity in Adversity: How Colleges Can Succeed in Hard Times. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Griffin, John M. "Underachieving Students in Community Colleges: Common Personality and Biographical Characteristics," Community College Review, 1980, Summer, 8(1): 15-19.

Hall, Robert A. and Richard L. Alfred. "Applied Research on Leadership in Community Colleges." Community College Review, 1985, Spring, 12(4): 36-41.

Hankin, Joseph N. and Philip A. Fey. "Reassessing the Commitment to Community Services." in William L. Deegan and Dale Tillery. Renewing the American Community College: Priorities and Strategies for Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Hesburgh, Theodore M. "Preparing for the Millennium: Finding An Identity and A Future." Change, 1983, October, 15(7): 14-17.

Hirschman, A. O. Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Declines in Firms, Organizations and States. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Establishing Alliances with Business and Industry." in George B. Vaughan. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Hudson, A. James and Ralph B. Smith. "Does General Education Have a Future?" Community College Review, 1976, Fall, 4(2): 57-63.

Hunt, Thomas C., Alexander C. Klieforth and Charles A. Atwell. "Community Colleges: A Democratizing Influence?" Community College Review, 1977, Spring, 4(4): 15-24.

Hunter, R. and M. S. Sheldon. Statewide Longitudinal Study. Report on Academic Year 1979-80. Part 4: Spring 1980 Results. Sacramento: Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges, 1981.

Johnson, B. L. Vitalizing a College Library. Chicago: American Library Association, 1939.

Kanter, Rosebeth Moss. "Quality of Work Life and Work Behavior in Academia." Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 1980, pp. 35-38. (incomplete reference)

Karabel, Jerome. "Open Admissions: Toward Meritocracy or Democracy?" Change, 1972, 4(4): 38-43.

Karabel, Jerome. "Community Colleges and Social Stratification." Harvard Educational Review, 1972, 42(4): 521-562.

Keller, George. Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Knoell, Dorothy M. "Serving Today's Diverse Students." in George B. Vaughan. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Kraetsch, Gayla A. "The Role of Community Colleges in the Basic Skills Movement." Community College Review, 1980, Fall, 8(2): 18-23.

Levine, Arthur. "Program: A Focus on Purpose and Performance." in Janice S. Green and Arthur Levine, Opportunity in Adversity: How Colleges Can Succeed in Hard Times. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Litten, Larry H. "Marketing Higher Education: Benefits and Risks for the American Academic System." Journal of Higher Education, 1980, 51(1): 40-59.

Lombardi, John. "Developmental Education: A Rapidly Expanding Function." Community College Review, 1979, Summer, 7(1): 65-72.

McCabe, Robert H. "How is the Time to Reform the American Community College." Community and Junior College Journal, 1981, 51(8): 6-10.

McCabe, Robert H. "Equity and Quality in College Education: An Essential American Priority." in John B. Bennett and J. W. Peltason (editors). Contemporary Issues in Higher Education: Self-Regulation and the Ethical Roles of the Academy. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1985.

McCabe, Robert H. and Suzanne B. Skidmore. "New Concepts for Community Colleges." in George B. Vaughan. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Martin, Warren Bryan. "Mission: A Statement of Identity and Direction." in Janice S. Green and Arthur Levine. Opportunity in Adversity: How Colleges Can Succeed in Hard Times. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Meyer, John W. "The Effects of Education as an Institution." American Journal of Sociology, 1977, 83 (1): 55-77.

Miller, Jerry W. "The Nature and Integrity of the Undergraduate Degree." in John B. Bennett and J. W. Peltason (editors). Contemporary Issues in Higher Education: Self-Regulation and the Ethical Roles of the Academy. New York: MacMillian Publishing Company, 1985.

Milner, M., Jr. The Illusion of Equality. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Moll, Richard. "Students: A Thoughtful Approach to Recruitment and Retention." in Janice S. Green and Arthur Levine. Opportunity in Adversity: How Colleges Can Succeed in Hard Times. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Nespoli, L. A. and S. V. Martorana. "Tensions in Defining Community College Missions: Problem or Opportunity? Community College Review, 1983-1984, 11(4): 3-11.

O'Keefe, Michael. "Emerging Challenges to Higher Education." in Janice S. Green and Arthur Levine. Opportunity in Adversity: How Colleges Can Succeed in Hard Times. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Orris, Jan Edward. "General Education in the Community College: A Megatrendian View." Community College Review, 1985, 13(1): 8-11.

Palmer, James C. "Do College Courses Improve Basic Reading and Writing Skills?" Community College Review, 1984 12(2): 20-28.

Parnell, Dale. The Neglected Majority. Washington, DC.: The Community College Press, 1985.

Pincus, Fred L. "The False Promises of Community Colleges: Class Conflict and Vocational Education." Harvard Educational Review, 1980, 50(3): 332-261.

Pollock, Art. "Promoting Instructional Excellence Through Class Scheduling." Community College Review, 1984, 12(2): 41-42.

Ratcliff, James L. "Should We Forget William Rainey Harper?" Community College Review, 1986, 13(4): 12-19.

Rhodes, Frank H. T. "Institutional Advancement and Funding." in John B. Bennett and J. W. Peltason (editors). Contemporary Issues in Higher Education: Self-Regulation and the Ethical Roles of the Academy. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1985.

Richardson, Jr., Richard, C., Elizabeth C. Fisk, and Morris A. Okun. Literacy in the Open-Access College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Richardson, Jr., Richard C. and William R. Rhodes. "Effective Strategic Planning: Balancing Demands for Quality and Fiscal Realities." in William L. Deegan and Dale Tillery. Renewing the American Community College: Priorities and Strategies for Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Riday, George E., Ronald D. Bingham and Thomas R. Harvey. "Satisfaction of Community College Faculty: Exploding a Myth." Community College Review, 1984-1985, 12(3): 46-50.

Roueche, John E. "Let's Get Serious About the High-Risk Student." Community and Junior College Journal, 49(9): 28-32, 1978.

Roueche, John E., George A. Baker III, and Suanna D. Roueche. "Access with Excellence: Toward Academic Success in College." Community College Review, 1985 12(4): 4-9.

Rounds, Jeanine C. and Dan Andersen. "Placement in Remedial College Classes: Required vs. Recommended." Community College Review, 1985, 13(1): 20-27.

Rudolph, Frederick. "A Historical Look at Institutional Success in Hard Times." in Janice S. Green and Arthur Levine. Opportunity in Adversity: How Colleges Can Succeed in Hard Times. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Seidman, Earl. In the Words of the Faculty: Perspectives on Improving Teaching and Educational Quality in Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Springfield, Jerry G. and John R. Hoffman. "Personal and Professional Characteristics of Continuing Education Administrators." Community College Review, 1984, 12(1): 36-40.

Sullins, W. Robert and Charles A. Atwell. "The Role of Small Rural Community Colleges in Providing Access." Community College Review, 1986, 13(4): 45-51.

Templin, Jr., Robert G. "Keeping the Door Open for Disadvantaged Students." in George B. Vaughan. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Templin, Robert T., David E. Daniel and Ronald W. Shearon. "Are Community Colleges Truly the 'People's' College?" Community College Review, 1977, 4(4): 7-14, 1977.

Thompson, Carol Parker. "Maintaining Quality with Open Access." Community College Review, 1985, 12(4): 10-14.

Townsend, Barbara K. "Faculty Role in Clarifying the Mission." Community College Review, 1984, 12(2): 4-7.

Vaughan, George B. "Balancing Open Access and Quality: The Community College at the Watershed." Change, 1984, 16(2): 38-44.

Vaughan, George B. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Vaughan, George B. The Community College Presidency. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1986.

Vogler, Daniel E. "Inservice: Developing Faculty Strength. Community College Review, 1980, 8(2): 35-40.

Warren, Jonathan. "The Changing Characteristics of Community College Students." in William L. Deegan and Dale Tillery. Renewing the American Community College: Priorities and Strategies for Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

Wattenbarger, James L. and Nancy J. Vader. "Adjusting to Decreased Revenues at Community Colleges in 1985," Community College Review, 1986, 13(4): 20-26.

Williams, F. Neil. "The Neglected Teachers: The Part-Time Faculty." Adult Leadership, 1972, 21(3): 83-84.

Wolfe, D. America's Resources of Specialized Talent. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Young, Raymond, J. and Yoswa Gwalamubisi, "Perceptions About Current and Ideal Methods and Purposes of Faculty Evaluation. "Community College Review, 1986, 13(4): 27-33.

Zwerling. L. Steven. "Reducing Attrition at the Two-Year Colleges." Community College Review, 1980, 8(2): 55-58.



ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
MAR 18 1988